

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is unfortunate that many excellent books by continental scholars, and not a few of even first-rate importance, remain inaccessible to English readers who know no language but their own. While it is true, as one may gratefully acknowledge, that some of the epoch-making work of very distinguished scholars, such as Wellhausen and Harnack, has appeared in English dress, it is equally true that work, scarcely less important, both of these and other scholars, has never been translated. Duhm's 'Theology of the Prophets' and Gressmann's influential work on eschatology remain unknown to students ignorant of German, as also all of Sellin's numerous and stimulating contributions to Old Testament science except his Introduction—so well translated by Mr. W. Montgomery—for which we have Professor Peake to thank.

But it is peculiarly unfortunate that Gunkel has remained so long unknown to the English-speaking public. For not only is he a great scholar who has made substantial contributions to Biblical science, but he has done brilliant work of a more popular kind, notably his little book entitled 'Selected Psalms'; and even his scientific work is invested with such literary grace that it could hardly fail to interest and even to fascinate the educated layman who had any interest at all in Biblical science. It is happily possible for English readers to taste Gunkel's quality in his 'Legends of Genesis,' but it is profoundly to be regretted that his great commentary on Genesis has never been made

accessible to them in an English translation—surely one of the most charming commentaries ever written on any book, and unquestionably our most brilliant commentary on Genesis.

We welcome, therefore, all the more eagerly the volume entitled *What Remains of the Old Testament* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), which has been so skillfully translated by the Rev. A. K. DALLAS, M.A., that at no point are we reminded that we are reading a translation. The book contains five essays, happily chosen to illustrate the range and variety of Gunkel's interests. Two of these are technical, one on 'Jacob,' which illustrates the scientific treatment of Genesis, the other on 'The Close of Micah,' which illustrates the literary and other problems lying behind prophecy. These essays will appeal more particularly to scholars.

The other three essays display Gunkel's power of appealing to a wider public. One of them deals with 'The Fundamental Problems of Hebrew Literary History,' and discusses the origin and development of Old Testament literary types—a field in which Gunkel has done pioneer work. In another, on 'The Religion of the Psalms,' he applies this idea of types to the Psalter, whose songs he classifies as Hymns, Songs of Praise, National Dirges, Court Songs, Individual Dirges, and Individual Songs of Praise, and he discusses the various aspects of religion exemplified by these types. This essay is refreshingly different from the

ordinary introductions to the Psalter and is replete with fruitful suggestion. But the longest and, in form, most popular essay of all is that on 'What is Left of the Old Testament,' which gives its title to the volume.

It is a pity that at this time of day such an essay needs to be written at all ; for, as Sir George Adam SMITH said long ago, the Book which was indispensable to the Redeemer must continue to be indispensable to the redeemed. But at intervals, from the second century to our own, the Old Testament has been the subject of more or less virulent attack. There are those in our schools and even Churches who contend that, as Christians, we can have nothing to learn from a literature which Christianity has transcended, and there are some who would even be glad to see the study of Hebrew and Hebrew literature disappear from the theological curriculum of students preparing for the ministry of the Church.

No one, of course, could cherish such desires or advocate such proposals who has any idea of the living continuity of history, or who realizes how essentially unintelligible much of the New Testament literature would be, if divorced from its historical antecedents. But we have to reckon with an atmosphere in which ignorance of the Old Testament even as literature and indifference to historical continuity prevail ; and it is in view of this atmosphere that Gunkel offers his fine defence of the Old Testament, and especially in view of the needs of the elementary school teachers of Germany who 'received in the Training Colleges an obsolete conception of the Bible.' Though this is certainly not the conception of the Bible taught in the Teachers' Training Colleges of Scotland, it is a conception even yet so widely prevalent in Britain that Gunkel's words are not without their application here.

He frankly admits, of course, the weaknesses of the Old Testament ; its science is not our science, nor are its morals always our morals. Jacob's trickery is not the less tricky that it is Jacob's, 'a roguish piece of folk-lore,' and the desire for vengeance that breathes through the last lines of Ps 137

is none the less terrible that it is historically intelligible. But there is more in the Old Testament than things like these ; and part of our difficulty in recognizing those other things is just that they have sunk so deeply into the mind of the world that we do not realize that they are the result of original thinking and of long and heroic struggle.

Take, for example, what Gunkel calls 'the imperishable power of the Moral Idea.' In our modern minds religion and morality are indissolubly associated. The Hebrew prophets answered once and for all the question 'Wherein consists the true service of God ?' and they answered it in ethical terms. But in this 'the prophets achieved a fundamentally new conception of religion.' With trenchant power they hammered into the hearts of their people, and, through their writings, into the heart of all mankind, the truth that the essence of sin among men is oppression of the lowly, and that righteousness consists in worthy treatment of the poor and the oppressed — a thought which has affected to the very roots all modern social legislation.

There are even aspects of religion in which the Old Testament is not only a valuable but an indispensable supplement to the New. Of the presence of God in Nature the New Testament has very little to say : there is practically nothing in it to correspond to the great Nature Psalms, the eighth, the twenty-ninth, above all, the glorious hundred and fourth. Again, there is little in the New Testament to match the overwhelming interest that the religion of the Old Testament takes in political affairs. And as the corollary of this is the great conception of world-history that permeates most of the prophetic literature and that receives its most systematic presentation in the Book of Daniel. All this is of direct value for our modern world and our modern conception of religion.

The very 'creedlessness,' as it has been called, of the Old Testament is also not without its value. Doubtless this indifference to systematic thinking is, as Gunkel admits, one of the weaknesses of the Hebrew mind ; yet its lack of interest in dogma, its



sheer incapacity to deal with or even to imagine the theological subtleties which are just beginning to be apparent in the New Testament, and in which the first four Christian centuries fairly revelled, is a healthy reminder of the limitations of reason and of the importance of seeing things in their true perspective. 'To see this sheer simplicity is good for us, a generation whose spiritual world has come to be as complex as our social conditions.'

Most of us do not adequately realize the finite obligation of the modern world to the Hebrew people and to the Old Testament. We should be prouder of our heritage if we understood it better. Two quotations from thoroughly unprejudiced witnesses illustrate this point. One is from Nietzsche: 'In the Old Testament of the Jews, the book of Divine righteousness, there are men, events, and words so great that there is nothing in Greek or Indian literature to compare with it.' The other is from the great historian of antiquity, Eduard Meyer, who says, 'Hebrew civilization, alone of all the other ancient Eastern civilizations, really stands on the same intellectual level as the Greek.' And Gunkel himself does not overstate the case when he describes the spiritual life of Israel as one of the foundations of the civilization of the Christian nations of Europe. 'Our civilization rests on two bases—the Bible and the civilization of Greece. We have become what we are in virtue of the combination of these two worlds. It would be a revolution, which no one living could estimate, if either of these foundations were to be moved.'

Not the least valuable feature of the Old Testament is its rich and varied gallery of personalities. Our own age is one in which personality tends to be swamped by the uniformity of the influences to which we are all alike subjected, crushed by the mighty machine which reduced us all to the same pattern. In the Hebrew world, unlike the Egyptian and the Babylonian world which was under the domination of despots and priests, personality had and took the opportunity of coming to its own; and 'the Old Testament, in its rugged strength, would be an iron in the blood for our time.'

Even on the score of its literary excellence, the Old Testament furnishes the teacher with an abundance of incomparable material; for where in the literature of the world are narratives that are inspired by a more winning simplicity or by more vivid and graphic power? But to meet the problems that suggest themselves to the growing minds of his older pupils, the teacher must train himself not only to the æsthetic and moral appreciation of the Old Testament, but to an understanding of the critical approach to it, and of the broad lines and results of the critical method.

With equal justice may this demand be made upon the preacher. We are in cordial agreement with Gunkel when he says that 'there should be more teaching on the part of the clergy than has been the case up till now.' A worshipping congregation never fails to respond to expository preaching when it is well done. Many of our best expositions, such as Dods' 'Genesis,' Sir George Adam Smith's 'Isaiah' and 'Minor Prophets,' Professor W. G. Jordan's 'Ancient Hebrew Stories and their Modern Interpretation,' were delivered to congregations in substantially the form in which they are printed. Thus may scholarship tend 'unto edification' not only of the mind, but of the spirit.

A note on the components of the phrase, 'Our Lord Jesus Christ,' may be useful in view of certain current discussions, in particular as to the origin and significance of the title 'Lord.' *Jesus* is the personal name of the human individual; and it is unnecessary to recognize more than a peculiar fitness in the fact that in Hebrew *Jesus* means 'Saviour,' because *Jesus* was quite a common name among the Jews when the Founder of our religion bore it.

The idea of Saviour is more properly conveyed by the name *Christ*, the Greek translation in the LXX of the Hebrew name *Messiah*, 'anointed.' But the name *Christ* lost in time its Hebrew connotation, no longer suggesting to the Greek mind the scion of the house of David who was to restore the fortune



of Israel, or the Son of Man from heaven who was to judge the living and the dead. Indeed, Christ came to be regarded as virtually an equivalent for Jesus.

---

As for the term *Lord*, the third component of the phrase under consideration, it is a term which is under investigation in our time, Bousset having opened up in his *Kyrios Christos* (1913) the whole problem of its meaning. But it was known, long before Bousset wrote the book above-named, that the term 'Lord' was used in the Græco-Roman religions of St. Paul's day with an absolute religious significance. It was a Divine predicate intelligible to the whole Eastern world.

---

Was the term 'Lord' applied to Jesus by His disciples and followers? If it was not applied to Him in His lifetime, it was after His death, as witness the saying, 'maranatha' (1 Co 16<sup>22</sup>). And as soon as 'mari' or 'maran' was translated into Greek by *κύριος* it took on the connotation of *κύριος* among Hellenistic Jews and Gentiles, signifying the object of their religious faith. Thus as the distinction between Jesus and Christ, while never actually lost sight of, gradually became obliterated in the usage of the Christian Church, the Greek title 'Lord' became invested with the essential meaning of the Hebrew term 'Messiah' or Christ.

---

Here is how Deissmann puts it in his *Light from the Ancient East* (the publication of a new and revised edition of this work is noticed in another column): 'St. Paul's confession of "Our Lord Jesus Christ" was his cosmopolitan expansion of a local Aramaic cult-title, *Marana*, applied to Jesus the Messiah by the apostolic Primitive Christians at Jerusalem, and occasionally even by Paul himself in the outer world. Like the complementary thought, that the worshippers are the "slaves" of the Lord, it was understood in its full meaning by everybody in the Hellenistic East, and it facilitated the spread of the Christian terms of worship and of the cult of Christ itself.'

---

There will always be two minds about mysticism, one profoundly appreciative, the other intensely critical. Some it will irresistibly attract, others it will repel. To some it is the kingly highway to ultimate reality, to others it is a deceitful path leading to an obscure and vacant wilderness. When Wordsworth says:

One impulse from a vernal wood  
May teach you more of man,  
Of moral evil and of good,  
Than all the sages can;

John Morley retorts, 'Such a proposition cannot be seriously taken as more than a half-playful sally for the benefit of some too bookish friend. No impulse from a vernal wood can teach us anything at all of moral evil and of good.' There you have two contrasted types of mind, the one logical and matter-of-fact, the other intuitive and mystical. The one is resolved to set everything in the clear light of reason, nor ever to stray beyond the realm within which ideas can be defined and classified, believing that here is for us the one circle of light within which we may safely walk. The other is sensitive to impressions that float in vaguely upon the soul from the dim unknown, feels that somewhere in that encircling gloom lies the true centre of things, and is eager to get away from the region where all can be seen and charted to explore the darkness wherein can be felt the mighty pulsations of the universal heart. Professor Otto has familiarized the world with the numinous, that dread mystery of the Divine which lies beyond our rationalizing, and he has applied to it the epithet '*fascinans*.' The mystic may be defined as one who has an overpowering sense of the *Mysterium Tremendum* and yields himself up to the fascination of it. The non-mystical mind keeps the reins tight in the hands of Reason and desires in all things to be under her control.

---

These diverse attitudes are illustrated in two papers which appear in the *Hibbert Journal* for April. The first is by Mr. Edmond HOLMES on 'The Mystic as Explorer.' 'The mystics are the pioneers, the leaders of mankind, in a great adventure, in the quest of God, in the exploration of the



unmapped realms of Reality.' Reality is to be distinguished from actuality. Actuality admits of no degrees: a thing either is, or is not. But when we speak of 'ultimate reality,' 'supreme reality,' 'innermost reality,' we imply gradations or differences of value. By what standard are these differences measured? 'To this question there is but one answer: An inward standard, a standard which is inherent in self-hood. It is in self, it is in and through our consciousness of self, that we recognize gradation in reality. The distinction between the higher and lower self is a valid distinction, and the difference is a difference in the grade or level of reality.' It is in self, therefore, that the quest of ultimate reality is to be carried on. 'The mystic's quest for God resolves itself into the quest of ultimate reality; and this resolves itself into the quest of the real self.' What does the mystic find in the deepest depths of the self? He cannot tell us. His conviction of the transcendent reality of his experience is equalled only by his feeling of impotence when he tries to describe it. He may be the adherent of some religion or school of philosophy; in any case he has to use the language of symbolism. But all that is on the surface. '*The true mystics are all Pantheists at heart.* They know with an assurance which is beyond all conviction that All is One. They know this through their own oneness with the All, in whom all things are One.'

What is pantheism? The word has two parts: *pan* means all, and *theos* means God. The pantheist is one who deifies the All of Being. In other words, he is one who identifies ultimate reality with the All as a living whole, with the totality of things in their indivisible unity, with the One in the Many, the One to whom the Many owe whatever reality they possess. Why does this conception of reality excite such fierce opposition? Because it says No to some of the most cherished and deep-rooted convictions of the average man. The average man takes for granted the intrinsic reality of his own individual self, and the intrinsic reality of the material world which he looks out upon. No one who has not freed himself from the spell of these two great illusions can even begin to understand what

pantheism really means. And the reason why the way to pantheism lies open to the mystics is that they have freed themselves from that spell, not indeed on the plane of intellectual thought, but on the higher plane of inward and spiritual experience.

---

'The message of the mystic to his fellow-men is that the light of love is at the heart of the world, at the heart of man's own real self, at the heart of all the space and all the ages. For this assurance we owe him an incalculable debt. How can we best repay it? By trying to walk where he has walked. By making him, at however great a distance we may follow him, our leader and our guide. But is he a trustworthy guide? What proof can he give that he has indeed lost and found himself in the light of love? This, that he does ardently desire to help us, that his heart is full of pity for his fellow-men.'

---

The second paper is by Professor OMAN and is a more critical study of mysticism. 'Mysticism is a phenomenon which always appears in times of political disillusionment and intellectual discouragement.' Its special marks are the process of banishing all ideas of sense from the mind, the reflection of some sort of unificatory theology, and, as its highest aims, ecstatic union with the Divine and passive reception of revelation. The question is whether there is a direct revelation of God which is not through experience of the world. The presupposition of mysticism is that experience is not a manifestation, but a veil which for moments waves aside and gives glimpses of reality. In Shelley's words:

Life, like a dome of many coloured glass,  
Stains the white radiance of eternity.

Accordingly mysticism begins with the demand to dismiss from the mind all imagery derived from the senses, and with it all the divisive ways of the discursive reason. But by this path nothing is reached except a sort of luminous vacancy. 'Pure mysticism,' as Edward Caird says, 'arrives at unity with empty hands.' There is no genuine increase of knowledge; the mystic merely sees in vision what he already believes. 'Many have assayed to write what was so given them. But it has all been pious



platitude, of the dullest type of conformity to orthodox patterns; while in every religion any writing ever cherished as a sacred book has been written by men who were facing life and the conflicts of experience, and that with the highest activities of all their powers of mind.' This is further confirmed by the certainty that in ordinary experience there is no such thing as passive awareness and apprehension.

How does mysticism stand in relation to Christianity? 'The fact is that there is no such thing in the strict sense as a Christian mystic. In so far as an external revelation, the Church, religious service and duties to fellow-mortals are essential parts of religion, mysticism is absent, at least the mysticism here meant, the essential aspect of which is that experience is not a revelation of God, but a cloud obscuring his glory, and that we must exclude all concern with it to win direct vision.' It may be

that when men lose themselves in a distracting age and in the dissipation of multifarious interests, such excursions from an active life as have been made by some Christian mystics may serve at least a temporary purpose of recollection. But the attitude of mysticism is full of moral danger. 'The contemplative who sets before himself the aim of reaching a state of vision from which he returns exhausted to practical life, there to recover vigour for a longer flight, is surely on the wrong track. . . . This is a shirking of the task of life, and not the real fulfilment of religion, which is, in freedom and independent thinking, to find our true relation to the past and to society and to the whole task of the Kingdom of God. This is a weary road, and mysticism is the most attractive of all caravanserais to linger in by the way. But, if we rest in it for the night, which for most of us at least is not for our real refreshment, we need to be up and facing all that life provides for us of venture early in the morning.'

---

## The Sermon on the Mount.

### The New Righteousness (Mt. v. 17-48).

BY THE REVEREND A. J. GOSSIP, M.A., ABERDEEN.

WHAT are we to make of these arresting sayings? People who ignore Christ as an idle dreamer of still idler dreams can irritably push them aside as on the face of them impossible, and not worth considering. For life, so they object, cannot be lived in that quixotic fashion, flinging oneself at windmills, and tilting at the whole set of the world. And so they fold their hands and settle down complacently in the conventional ways, as if these were as inevitable as the laws of Nature. But that won't do for men and women who profess to take Christ seriously, and to have made His mind their guiding star. For us to skip all this, and turn to something soothing and heartening like the prodigal or some of the rich promises, conveniently forgetting this uncomfortable and upsetting teaching, is deliberately to disobey One whom we call the very Word of God; to look Him in the eyes and tell Him that He knows nothing about life; to set our jaws squarely and doggedly and answer, 'I will not.'

Yet what are we to do? Here are we set down to live in this very difficult kind of a world; and here too, obstinately, are these sayings of Christ which don't seem to fit into it at all, that look flatly impracticable, so that quite early glosses were slipped into the later manuscripts to break the force of the wind. 'Whosoever is angry,' said Christ; 'without a cause,' inserted a soul unable to keep up with Him. And indeed they are thrown down in the most arresting way without any qualifications, even such as our Lord Himself practised in the living of His own life; and sometimes with such a noisy clashing of part against part that it is not easy to piece the whole into a consistency within our dull and prosy minds, which in their pedantic fashion ask for little invariable rules and a full code of minute by-laws, and are given instead, much to their discomfiture, mighty principles which we are left to apply for ourselves; and that through the exercise, not only of loyalty and faith



fulness, but of common sense and courage and a sense of proportion and even of humour. Newman went over to the Church of Rome largely because it told him definitely what to believe and what to do, took the ordering of things away from him and so saved him from the turmoil of uncertainty in his own mind, and the bother and the danger of decision. But resolutely Christ insists on treating us, not as babes in leading-strings, but as grown men and women. Here is the mind of God, He says, here also is your life; and, with the help of God and all the aids He has contrived for you, you must take that first and work it out into the stuff and pattern of this other with your own hands.

And the difficulty with which the Sermon on the Mount confronts us is just this, that nowhere is the immense originality of our Lord's bewildering mind more visible and staggering. For thousands of years we have been climbing towards Him, been peering up at Him, been teasing and fingering at the edges of His teaching. And yet His is still so lonely a soul that, when even now He says these things to us, we look up at Him puzzled and dumb-founded and not at all certain whether He is serious or not. He is. And our plain business as Christian people is twofold. We must with care avoid a wooden literalness, that might easily enough miss the whole spirit of what He lays upon us. That first, that very certainly. Surely, for instance, there is a very obvious distinction between wild asseverations in our common speech and an oath in the law courts, which last our Lord Himself once took. That practice enjoined upon us there may not be flattering to our veracity, may openly hint doubts which we may find insulting. Yet surely looking to the fact that the Law deals with weighty and momentous issues, that life itself may be at stake, it is bound to take all possible precautions to ensure that it is founding, not upon fictions or mere suppositions, but on facts and truth; there too, no doubt, that precaution 'comes of evil' in the sense that it has been made necessary by human depravity, and in an ideal world would cease to be required. But, as things are, what can we do? Yet if a stodgy and unimaginative literalness is to be avoided, even more must we see to it that we are not simply leaving these disquieting laws of Christ upon one side, but are really endeavouring to work them into the practical living of our lives. It won't do to say, as a Prime Minister did not long ago, that obviously the State cannot be run upon the lines of the Sermon on the Mount. If we are not prepared to follow, both as a nation and as individuals, what we admit to be

Christ's teaching, then why call ourselves Christians at all? 'Have you taken the name of Christ,' asked Leighton long ago, 'on purpose to dishonour it?'

This at least is clear that in these sayings we have a picture of the humanity of the future. For if anything is certain it is this—that any real advance that is to be will be along the lines of Jesus Christ. It is amazing how already He has moved to the centre of things, has Himself become the centre of things. For consider the astonishing facts! Here is One who was hustled to His death as a bad man, as One whose character and teaching were polluting the people's minds and morals, so that the authorities felt they must at all costs take the most drastic action. Yet now if anybody asks, 'But what is goodness?' the inevitable answer is, and must be, Look at Jesus Christ. Even in non-Christian India the highest adjective of admiration is Christlike. He was condemned as a blasphemer. People clapped quick horrified hands to outraged ears at the dreadfulness of His views of God. It was just shocking, so they said with unanimity. Yet now the one thing certain is that, if there be a God at all, He is Christ's God, and is Himself like Jesus Christ. As a distinguished Anglican divine has put it, 'To-day people are not worrying about the deity of Christ, but they are immensely interested in the Christlikeness of God.' In His own day His practice and teaching as to the Sabbath, the Scriptures, the grace of God, a score of things, seemed horribly immoral. But now we are learning that they are the only possible truths, have found that to be right we must follow with exactness in Christ's steps. So far we have slowly penetrated into His originality. But there are still infinite deeps in it we have not yet begun to sound, as these sayings now before us, and the shock they give us, prove. Yet these too are true: and one day others will look back at us, counting us hardly Christian in any full sense at all, wondering how we could have missed or been stumbled by elements of the Master's will which by their day will have become accepted as the only possibility, and the obvious way of things.

The fact is there have been two main forks in the tree of life. The one was when the animal and vegetable kingdoms separated. The latter had an easier and prettier road to much quicker results. And very glorious these are—the stateliness of trees, the greenness of grass, the loveliness of flowers. But along that line progress was arrested and came to a halt. The other took a road that



looks uglier and more squalid, through carnage and competition and blood. But it has climbed far higher to the grace of self-sacrifice and all the glories of humanity. The second all-decisive fork is Christ or not Christ. Turn your back on Him, and you may and will reach many wonderful things. Comfort and mechanical efficiency and a hugely interesting world—all this and much more are still open to you. But if you want to climb as high as soul, you must take Christ's way and follow Him. The road is steeper, the toil is harder, but the results are far more glorious. And if we refuse what we know to be Christ's will, we are taking the downhill path to degeneracy and decay and death; or at the least to an arresting of all higher progress. The man depicted in the Sermon on the Mount is the man of the future.

There are those, no doubt, who deny this; maintaining that this teaching is not of the future, but is flyblown and antiquated and out of date, carried to our modern bustling world like a dying echo from a primitive day when life was immeasurably more simple than it is now; and the complexity of our society and the intricacy of our problems had not risen on men's minds. This, they argue in effect, is legislation that might work in some small family clan, but nowadays the thing is utterly and hopelessly impossible.

For myself I resent that bland assumption that would dismiss Christ a little superciliously as One who came out of a small time, and whose mind and teaching are coloured by the smallness of His environment. Historically it has not a statable case. For the disconcerting fact is that nearly all our problems are more or less perennial. There were doles in Greece centuries before Christ, and war-time prohibition in China thousands of years ago, and leagues of nations often in quite early days. And Christ lived in a world which in essence was quite bewilderingly like our own, and among men and women whose hearts were strikingly akin to our hearts now. And our lofty attitude towards those old days and to the Master's teaching that came out of them is silly enough. Somehow the moderns who presume to talk down to Christ and to push Him aside as out of date, on the basis of their alleged fuller knowledge of life and the larger world in which we dwell, don't look bigger or cleverer or wiser than He; in short, they make themselves preposterously ridiculous, until one blushes hot for those who have no notion what clumsy, blundering, gawky souls they really are in Jesus' presence. If Christ followed the tradition upon any subject, then be sure that that was not

merely tradition but the law of God. And if Christ, with deliberation and not hesitating to pay down the whole cost of His audacity, broke with the prevailing views, as on the sanctity of marriage, or with the unanimous prophetic custom, as on the drink question, and took a startlingly new and lonely road of His own, the Church resiles from that originality of His and goes back to the old ways He discredited, or to the prophetic views which He discarded, as to a quicker and truer and more thorough plan, at its own peril, aye, and at that of many generations. Take the instance given here, that of divorce. In our Lord's day that was granted easily on many grounds; any mere incompatibility of temper, or any roving of desire, was often held to be enough. But Christ daringly laid it down that only one reason was valid. And how much of decency and moral uplift the world owes to that. Yet nowadays a popular view is to talk disparagingly of His ruling as of a quaintly old-fashioned notion which the modern world has quite outgrown and definitely left behind. The United States considers itself a Christian nation, yet blatantly it pays little or no attention to Christ's mind upon this subject. What does it matter what He held? We know far better nowadays! And so with open eyes they have gone back to the very kind of thing from which He lifted us. It is easy fastening on vivid and distressing cases to build up a plea. Is a woman to be tied for life to a drunkard or a criminal or a lunatic? That is, indeed, a fearsome fate. And yet society must come before the individual. And where the sanctity of the marriage tie is loosened, civilization crumbles. 'For better or worse, for richer or poorer, in sickness or in health,' that is a covenant touched by the glow and splendour and chivalry of love. But to make a business contract which, if it does not pay us dividends in comfort big enough to please us, we immediately dissolve, that is not to pass ahead of Christ, but to slip far below the level that He set us. The full flowering time of His teaching in the world is not over and past; it lies still far ahead.

Yes, but it is not enough for us to look eagerly forward, and sing, 'It's coming yet for a' that,' with a thrill in our heart, and a huzza in our voice; and so, envying the happy people of the time to be, settle down meantime in our own ways as the one possibility for us as yet. We too must work these sayings here and now into our hearts and lives. And how?

What strikes me first about this new righteousness is the honouring claims Christ makes upon us.



That is what nowadays most thrills me in the Gospels. Not, as was once the case, the promises, but the demands, the glorious assumptions, the fact that looking at us He pitches things so high. What do ye more than others? He turns to us and asks. For He expects that Christian people will in any company move to the front by right: that as at the War men fell by natural selection and a kind of inescapable inevitableness into their fitting places, and he who could lead did lead, and he who could not fell in behind, as a matter of course, and followed, so Christian folk will by the nature of things prove themselves bigger and braver and wiser and more unselfish in the living of their lives than others. And that for two reasons. First, because they have an instinct that fastens on what matters and concentrates mainly on that, and sets lesser things into their due or secondary place. To-day many people boast with pride that they are so busy about carrying out the gospel in social reform that they have no time to be bothered with the mere rites of religion. And they say it not at all ashamed, but quite convinced that they are farther on than those who still waste time about the Churches and the like. And Christ looks at them. You are in the kingdom, He says, but just in it—'the least in it,' nothing more. And, on the other hand, there are those whose energy and thought are concentrated solely upon matters of ritual and so on, who are tremendously in earnest over these, quite staggeringly so indeed: shall we say upon early communion, and fasting and the like? And Christ declares with emphasis that if that is all they have to show they are not in the Kingdom at all. The righteousness I claim, He says, is something more than that. The real Christian, so He tells us, has a balance of mind that uses means as means, and ends as ends, and does not grow confused between the two, but puts each in its own fitting place. And further, he has something of his Master's eagerness to use his life with thoroughness and for the biggest things. Browning tells of a soul dragged forward like a conscript 'out of the glad, safe rear into the dreadful van.' But where there is sacrifice to be made, and danger to be faced, the Christian leaps forward, always volunteering, always first. So Christ expected. And yet is it so with us? Sacrifice! we say, drawing back, not liking the look of the dreadful van, preparing to slink into the safe, glad rear again. But, we stammer in confusion, I thought the whole point of this faith was that through it one gets off, that less will do, that in view of this grace of God toward us we need not worry as we used to do, nor

mind nearly so much how we live, for He will get us through somehow. Isn't it so? I understood that the Cross means that the moral laws are in some way to swerve aside in our favour, that an exception in their working is to be made on our behalf, that a poor life with Christ will be accepted in place of a fine life without Christ. Well, it doesn't. Not so did they understand it in the New Testament. Rather they caught infection from their Master's chivalry. If Christ carried His cross, then so must I; if He gave His life, here is mine too. The faith is not an opiate but a spur, an inspiration, a compulsion to do more, far more than we had ever seen before to be our duty. The whole meaning of the thing is to create a world at last of spirits like Christ, flinging their lives away for God and others in His joyous and unreckoning way; and you and me among them. And if we don't wish that, then Christ is not for us.

And then there is the almost dreadful inwardness of this new righteousness. Law is a crude makeshift affair. It deals only with what is overt. Conduct, and what is written down, and words before credible witnesses, these are its sphere, but beyond that it cannot press into what a man is in the hush and hidden places of his own heart. But all the great religious teachers follow us into these remote fastnesses—past conduct and past words, and down into the secrecy of thought. 'Thought,' says a Buddhist, 'that mysterious essence of being.' And so indeed it is. It is difficult to credit that a solid piece of matter, a dour lump of a thing, is in reality no lump, but is composed of endless mobile electrons in perpetual motion. And all this busy life about us is built up of that airy insubstantial substance, always forming in these brains of ours, that we call thought as certainly as all the vivid pageantry of his dreams and the long procession of his characters were fashioned within Shakespeare's mind. And thus if one wishes really to change and cleanse the world, one must get back to thought, the final material out of which life is woven. That is why legislation, which deals only with outward things is, and must be, so inadequate; why politicians are at best mere fumbling amateurs; why in the last resort we must rely upon God's prophets who dig deeper, and push matters farther back, and strive to change, not our environment alone, but our innermost selves. For nothing less will serve. If a river runs foul and polluted through a city, it is nothing like enough to prevent the factories within its bounds from disgorging refuse into the waters. When that is done, the cure may prove to be no



cure, and the stinking yellow scum may still float past, breeding disease. You must get powers to start far farther back, and deal with the pollutions at the river's source. So here. Because, as Browning has it :

I am ware it is the seed of act  
God holds appraising in His hollow palm,  
Not act grown great thence on the world below  
Leafage and branchage vulgar eyes admire.

And so our Lord, lighting a candle, takes us down into the dusty little-visited recesses of our hearts. Conduct, He says, that's little ; let us probe much farther in. You have not murdered : are you sure of that ? Look at your hands again ! Is not that blood on them ? If you have hated any one, or been angry with any one, that itself ranks as murder, as I judge. If you have been contemptuous to any even in thought, have sniffed at him, so the word seems to mean, there is no penalty that you do not wholly deserve. If looking down upon a man of lesser chance and smaller education you have said or thought, 'You stupid ! Even the flaming of Gehenna were not too dreadful for a heart like yours !' So Christ says, and He means it ; and He is to be our Judge. Truly if these be His standards for us, and if this is what He calls sin, if He should mark iniquity, who could stand !

And He passes deeper yet, past thought itself, and down into the imagination. Ezekiel has a terrible picture of certain old men, much respected in the city, leading clean and unchallengeable lives, who when the darkness fell, stole out into the night, and furtively slipt through the streets, and up into the Temple, locking its doors behind them, and so to a hidden postern let secretly into a wall, and through it, locking it too with care, and in that room where none might follow, and where even God's eyes they felt did not see, its walls all covered over with loathsome pictures and obscenities of hateful crawling filthy things, they carried through unspeakable orgies to unthinkable gods, and so watchfully crept forth, and back through the now silent streets, and out into their irreproachable lives again and the respect of decent unsuspecting men and women. What do you dream about ? asks Christ. What do you picture when you are alone ? And holding up that searching light of His, He flashes it upon the walls of our imagination to show—what ? Is it reptiles and crawling things and horrors hidden away ? Are we as true and pure there in that secret place, with never an eye to see, as out in the broad light of staring day ? Your conduct may be blameless,

and your words irreproachable, your very thoughts immaculate. But what of your imagination ? Dare you face that test ?

And yet so terrible is it to Christ that one should be smirched by evil even there, that He plunges into that terrific metaphor, surely the most heart-shuddering thing in Scripture, about the right hand cut off and the right eye torn out—anything, everything to be saved from this foul, festering pollution ! Once on a day I had a ghastly experience. The 'phone rang early in the morning, and an hysterical woman's voice bade me come instantly. I went, and found that a most brilliant student had suddenly gone crazy in the night, had with a safety-razor blade cut off his hand, and lay there laughing exultantly. 'I did right,' he cried, 'I can look Jesus in the face.' They took him to the hospital, his hand beside him in a paper bag, and from thence to the asylum, poor crazed soul ! But as I stood there in that blood-splashed place, Christ's hate and terror of sin even in thought came rushing in upon me. Pluck it out ! Cut it off ! Or it will fester, poison, slay your soul !

Lastly, this new righteousness is a positive and not simply a negative thing : is more by far than mere painful avoidance of evil ; it is a glorying in doing right, and that according to a marvellous standard. Stevenson once sent a letter to his mother which he headed 'A Christmas Sermon,' denouncing the gloom of his father's religion, and underlining this conception that Christianity is much more than a not-doing this and a not-doing that. These negative commands, he wrote, have a 'black, angry look' ; and, indeed, till one has actual 'pleasure in these difficult decisions,' things are not well with us ; and after all the whole of essential morality is 'just kindness.' Well, Christ agrees with that. What we have to do, said He, is just to love. But when Stevenson imagined that that makes things greatly easier for us, in the deepest sense he is surely entirely wrong. Not easier, but harder ; far, far harder. For look at what Christ means by loving. Take those tremendous sayings that have puzzled the world ever since they were uttered, and around which there is a constant din and never-settling dust of controversy about non-resistance and the like. They look as if they outlawed war : they look as if they ruled out law : they look as if they opened the door of opportunity for every impudent and importunate scamp to fatten on his fellows' kindness and credulity. And what are we to do with them ? Are they meant to be vivid metaphors, like that about the hand and eye ? Or are they



to be taken literally? Is the world, for example, waiting for a martyr nation, who will not resist when threatened by war, but go to its Cross, as Christ went to His, and so lift the earth to better things? Perhaps I have a barbarous soul that has been left behind by the rising tide of understanding of what the faith means. Yet there are wars conceivable to which, should they spring upon us, I for one would have to go again; or else not be able to look Christ in the eyes. And I believe in law as a Divine appointment that has changed this world from an uneasy scene of tyranny and insecurity into a safe and kindly place. And I will not give to some rogues whose life is a deliberate deception of better, aye, and sometimes poorer, people than themselves, and who by that are losing their own souls. But I will do my little part as a voter and as a Christian to prevent wars of aggression, and seek to stamp these altogether from God's earth: and I will pay my taxes uncomplainingly to help my less fortunate fellows, and try to be generous upon the Christian scale: and I will seek to be easy to live with, and not quarrelsome even about my undoubted rights, but forbearing and large-minded and kind. But easy! The truth is, says Christ, that what is wrong is that you are all using far too low a standard, with the result that you are much too quickly satisfied. It is not nearly enough to be just—though even that God knows is hard to practise; or to claim no more than your bare dues; or to pay your fellows their full rights, or to deal with men as they deserve. All that is far less than your bounden duty. When you use such things

as your scale of measurement you are taking custom, or the conventions, or other people round about, or at the best the worthiest of them, as your index of how you ought to live and what you ought to be. And none of these will do. For your standard is God. For you to live deliberately on a lower moral plane than God is failure. And look yonder! There is an open sinner; yet you see the sunshine does not skip his fields! And there a scandalously immoral man; yet on his croft the rains fall just as healingly as upon any other. And you too in God's generous way must blot out enmity however well deserved as men judge things, must forget ingratitude, must meet rank unworthiness and worse with a queer stubborn love that keeps on obstinately loving in despite of everything. So only shall you prove yourselves the children of that Father who, whatever you have done, still unaccountably persists in loving you.

But who is sufficient for these things? Like some barbarian looking into Plato, aye, far more confusedly, so do I peer into the mind of Christ, as at a thing how far beyond and above me as yet. Only you remember Bunyan, how the evangelist asked, 'Do you see yonder wicket gate?' And the man answered, 'No, I don't.' 'Well, do you see that shining light,' he was next asked, and he replied, 'I think I do.' Keep that light in your eye, and you will reach the goal in time, so he was told. Let us, too, keep our eyes on Christ, and follow Him on to the end of all we see to be His will, as that will becomes ever fuller to us. And in us also it will all come true in time.

---

## Latinity of the Pastorals.

BY THE REVEREND F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D., TOLLESHUNT KNIGHTS, MALDON.

ST. PAUL moved with the times. He was keenly alive to every opportunity for founding a new community. And, if possible, he would carry out his plan, frustrated so long by Jewish cabals, of winning the vigorous people of Gaul and Spain to the faith. He must have seen that the great Latin peoples that had recently come into the empire were intensely proud of their new status, and would prove worthier converts than Oriental or Greek. The Apostle's style had been considerably changed by his two long imprisonments

in Cæsarea and Rome. His powers had been curtailed, his vigour sapped. He was a prematurely aged man in his Roman lodging. His circumstances and inclinations and his bodily weakness made him briefer and more concise in his periods; and perhaps a little more egotistical, and at the same time more human. We cannot think that he was so engrossed in his controversies with Jews and Gentiles, and in the affairs of the Churches he had founded, that he had not some mental recreation. In the Argiletum, the next street to



where he lodged, he or his friends would purchase at the book-stalls copies of the Latin classics, the letters and orations of Cicero among them. For he knew if he was to work in Spain that he would have to speak Latin. Strabo, who wrote about A.D. 19, says of the Spaniards, 'the dwellers in the regions of the Baetis have been so thoroughly Romanised that they have actually forgotten their own tongue' (151). He would not have been slow to seize the opportunity of conversing in Latin with the well-trained and educated Prætorian who was always with him—a man of pure Italian birth, who despised everything Greek, language and people. It was the ambition of many an Italian youth to qualify for the Guards, in stature and education. The lessons they had learned from Horace and Virgil in their youth would be often on their lips. Suetonius relates that when Nero sought to induce some of the Guards to share his flight, one answered in the words of Virgil, 'Usque adeone mori miserum est?' (*Æn.* 12. 642) ('Is it so wretched a thing to die?'). He would hear them quoting snippets of Terence, Plautus, and Horace, and he would reset the quotations in his own Greek; and so we have 'Approve things that are excellent' (Ph 1<sup>10</sup>) ('video meliora proboque,' Ovid, 7. 21); and 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable . . . think on these things' (Ph 4<sup>8</sup>) ('quid verum atque decens curo et rogo et omnis in hoc sum,' Hor. *Ep.* i. 1. 11); where the expression 'if there be any praise' is meaningless in Greek, as *ἐπαινος* does not mean an act deserving praise, whereas the Latin *laus* does, 'merui qui laude coronam' (Virg. *Æn.* 5. 55).

This new experience in the Apostle's life helps to explain the difference in the style of the Pastorals from the Paulines generally. There is a great difference between the argumentative Romans and the philosophical Ephesians, but in the Pastorals we are dealing with a third style, equally different from both, and yet possessing many Pauline peculiarities. A change of amanuensis, unless such a person was given a very free hand, which would have been unlike Paul to grant, could not explain this difference. We must take into account his Latin studies, and the fact that he was hourly, for two years, in the company of an Italian who would not speak Greek, and with whom he would have to converse in Latin. The letter about Phœbe (Ro 16) marks the transition to the new style, which we may call the Pastoral, and which was better adapted to his present work of consolidation than the oratorical. In the formation of this style he was assisted by Latin terms and

phrases, which helped him to give more precise formulæ of doctrine, and more exact specification of the ethical and spiritual qualifications for the various offices and employments in the ministry, and also to express his *indignatio sæva* in mordant and masterly passages which recall the annihilating tongue of Cicero. In the Pastorals we have a preciseness, a clear-cut finish in theological statements and summaries. In the Paulines the thoughts are too great at times for expression. He cannot formulate them with exactness. The thought is struggling with its medium. But here great theological statements are presented with a sharp edge, a finished form or *ὑποτύπωσις* (2 Ti 1<sup>13</sup>). These statements are not to be expanded or paraphrased, but to be committed to memory. Here we note the effect of the Latin in its lucidity as well as in its authority. Latin is the language of conquerors as well as of orators. It is strong in commands. There are thirty imperatives in 2 Ti. The passages that show most difference in style from the Paulines reveal the influence of Latin in their short, curtailed, and also cumulative sentences. And if we want literary parallels to the Pastorals we have to seek them in Latin. Compare with their condensed summaries and imperatives and statements of qualifications for the various offices the condensed summary of the law of the state magistrates in Cicero's *De Legibus*, iii. 3-5. It contains ninety-nine lines (Titus has ninety-two), and is an introduction to, and explanation of, the various state offices, ædiles (like the deacons, 'ad honoris amplioris gradum is primus ascensus'; cf. 1 Ti 3<sup>13</sup>—deacons secure a good step (*βαθμός*) for themselves), prætors, consuls, etc., defining their *potestas* and *imperium*. It abounds in imperatives. We have also the *commentarium isagogicum*, or introductory treatise which Varro wrote for Pompeius in 69 B.C., the *commentariolum petitionis*, or instructions about his canvass for the consulship which Quintus thought fit to send his brother, the great Tullius, in 64 B.C., and the letter which Tullius wrote to Quintus (*Q. Fr.* i. 1) in 60 B.C., about his duties as proprætor of Asia. This is a masterly document on the duties and conduct of a Roman governor of a province, which might be entitled 'How one ought to behave in a Province,' just as the letters to Titus and Timothy might have the headline, 'How one should behave in the Church of God' (1 Ti 3<sup>15</sup>). Similar points are stressed in both documents. The letter to Quintus was intended to brace him up for his work, so that he should not be dejected by the extension of the period of his office to three years, but should rouse



himself up to master his duties (4); cf. 1 Ti 1<sup>3</sup>, 'As I exhorted you to stay on (in spite of difficulties) in Ephesus.' The Second Epistle is an exhortation from beginning to end. Cicero says his letter has become a formal lecture, 'ad *præcipiendi* rationem delapsa oratio.' Each of the three Pastorals might be called a '*præcipiendi ratio*' or formal lecture. Cicero had given his brother the hope of an early retirement from Ephesus (1). St. Paul had evidently encouraged Timothy with the same idea. Now both writers entreat their friends to stay on in Ephesus and to do their best, one for the State, the other for the Church. 'You are in a place,' wrote Cicero, 'where everything depends on your own virtue and wise rule' (5). The same thought runs through the Pastorals. Cicero refers to the 'grave *controversies* and great *contentions*' among the provincials (ii. 7). Paul also spoke of '*controversies* (*λογομαχίαι*) from which arise contentions' (*διαπαράτριβαί*) (1 Ti 6<sup>4</sup>). In *de Leg.* 1. 20, Cicero spoke of the '*verborum controversiæ*' among philosophers.

Both writers condemn the love of money. Cicero warns his brother against people who do everything *pecuniæ causa* (v. 15); and not to allow his more sordid officials to make gain (*quaestus*) out of their offices. Paul warned Titus against those who teach false doctrines for the sake of sordid gain, *αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν* (i. 11), and insists on his bishops and deacons being free from the same love of gain or money (Tit 1<sup>7</sup>). Again, Cicero warned his brother against backbiters and hypocrites, and especially Greeks, 'false and trained to excessive flattery' (v. 16). Paul warns Timothy against the hypocrisy of false teachers (1 Ti 4<sup>2</sup>), says he must not listen to charges against the presbyters, and that the deacons must not be 'double-tongued' (1 Ti 3<sup>8</sup>). Speaking of Asia generally, Cicero says the things that are respectable, such as integrity, continence, self-respect (*pudor*), and the serious and regular discipline of the household '*familiae gravis et constans disciplina*' (vi. 18) would seem almost Divine in such a corrupting province and amid such low moral surroundings. In 1 Ti 1<sup>9</sup>, 10 Paul gave a long list of sins and wickednesses practised in that province and elsewhere. Cicero warns Quintus against entrusting things to men who were not above suspicion, and even to faithful slaves. 'Commit and entrust these things,' said Paul, 'to faithful men' (2 Ti 2<sup>2</sup>). Cicero warns his brother against the insinuating manner of the Greeks. They worm themselves into your confidence. Their friendships are pushing, not reliable. They whisper into your ears for the sake of

gain (vi. 16). Paul describes the false teachers who worm their way into families, and lead captive silly women (2 Ti 3<sup>8</sup>); and also their dupes, whose ears are itching for news, and who heap teachers on themselves (2 Ti 4<sup>3</sup>). On the other hand, Cicero urges his brother to rouse himself to win golden opinions from all sorts of people (14<sup>41</sup>); and Paul says that it is necessary to be well spoken of by those who are without (1 Ti 3<sup>7</sup>). And both insist on 'steady and serious household discipline,' for which Grecian Asia was not remarkable. Deacons are therefore to rule their children and their households well (1 Ti 3<sup>19</sup>); and bishops are to do the same, 'for if one does not rule his own household well, how can he rule the Church of God?' (1 Ti 3<sup>6</sup>). 'Control yourself,' said Cicero, 'and you will have no trouble in controlling those you rule' (ii. 7). 'Self-control' is one of the topics of the Pastorals. The bishop who rules must rule himself, *ἐγκρατής* (Tit 1<sup>7</sup>). The word *σώφρων* implies continence. Cicero warned Quintus against carelessness in choosing or recommending friends. 'You must use circumspection, for you are not only responsible for your own conduct, but for all the ministers of your government' (iii. 10). Timothy is likewise not to ordain without caution, as he is responsible for them to the Church, and he might be involved in the sins of others (5<sup>22-25</sup>). Paul urged Timothy to test the candidates before allowing them to become deacons (1 Ti 3<sup>10</sup>). Cicero urged his brother to sift carefully the characters of his officials, as he was responsible not only for their deeds, but their words (4<sup>1</sup>). 'Our ancestors did not recklessly (*temere*) give the office of "accensus" to any but their own freedmen' (iv. 13). 'Lay hands recklessly (*ταχέως*) on no man,' said Paul (1 Ti 5<sup>22</sup>). Quintus is warned against favouritism and partiality. His court decisions are not to be influenced by favour (*gratia*; vii. 20). There must be consistency and dignity (*gravitas* = *σεμνότης* only in 1 Ti 2<sup>2</sup> 3<sup>4</sup>, Tit 2<sup>7</sup>), which resists not only favour (*gratia*), but the suspicion of it. Timothy when dealing with the presbyters is ordered to act without prejudice and favour (*πρόσκλησις*) (1 Ti 5<sup>21</sup>). Quintus must give no occasion to any one to talk or abuse him (*vituperatio*; vi. 17). Titus (2<sup>7</sup>) is to 'show himself an example of good works, that the enemy may have nothing bad to say about us.' The fear of bringing scandal upon the cause is the greatest deterrent in both documents. 'Lest the word of God be basely injured' (blasphemed) (Tit 2<sup>5</sup>), 'lest the name of God and the doctrine be injured' (do.) (1 Ti 6<sup>4</sup>). Cicero says of Grati dius, 'I am sure he is just as anxious for our reputation as for his own'



(iii. 10). So there must not be the slightest breath of suspicion about a Church official. He must be 'sans peur et sans reproche' (ἀνέγκλητος, ἀνεπίληπτος; 1 Ti 3<sup>5</sup>; cf. v.<sup>14</sup>), lest the cause should suffer. Cicero commends to Quintus the example of Cyrus, who blended 'summa gravitas' with 'singularis comitas.' So Timothy is to instruct with πραότης (comitas, 2 Ti 2<sup>25</sup>), and Titus is to show gravity, σεμνότης (Tit 2<sup>7</sup>), in his instruction. Cicero censures his brother's iracundia and acerbitas (xiv. 40), and says his letters have made him 'patientior leniorque.' 'A bishop also must not have this wrathful disposition,' ὀργυλος (Tit 1<sup>7</sup>). He must be ἐπεικής (1 Ti 3<sup>8</sup>), not πλῆκτης (Tit 1<sup>7</sup>) like the 'plagosus' Orbilius, who instructed young Horace. Cicero's advice to Quintus, 'to be temperate, to restrain all desires, to control one's people, to show oneself easy of access and ready to listen to argument,' might have served as a text for the Pastorals. He also urged Quintus to give all his attention to his work, 'incumbe toto animo et omni studio' (ix. 271; cf. 1 Ti 4<sup>15-16</sup>, 'ponder these things, be wholly engaged in them,' ἐν τοῖτοις ἵσθι (cf. 'totus in illis'), 'attend to yourself and the teaching, continue in them.' Cicero appeals to the 'common faith which is owed to all men' ('communis fides quae omnibus debetur'), Paul to the common faith, κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν (Tit 1<sup>4</sup>), possessed by all Christians. Cicero reminds Quintus of his studious youth and virtuous life (x. 29); as Paul reminds Timothy of his youthful studies (2 Ti 3<sup>14</sup>). One says the governor must show hospitality and friendship (v. 16); the other says the bishop must be hospitable, φιλόξενος (1 Ti 3<sup>2</sup>, Tit 1<sup>8</sup>). These are striking parallels. In letters of similar import similar sayings would occur, but the similar mentality of these writers cannot be so explained. Both writers lay stress on the same principles of government, often in the very same phrases. Both consider the final cause of the Law. Cicero declares it to be 'the greatest happiness of the governed' (8. 24); St. Paul, 'love' (1 Ti 1<sup>5</sup>). Says Cicero, 'If you were set over fierce and barbarous nations, it would be the object of your humanity to consult their interests and serve their welfare (salus), and give your whole attention to love them, protect them, and make them happy' (8. 23). The writer of the Pastorals writes as a cultivated Roman Christian. His ideas move in a distinctly Roman circle. His thoughts and aims are projected along the distinctly Roman lines of personal dignity, piety, obedience to superior officers, equity in judgment, moderation, integrity, self-control, discipline, organization, and faithfulness to one's trust. . . .

The proprætor and his staff of officials and officers, his quaestor, legati, and all the ministers of the government, working together for the moral and material welfare (salus) of the provincials, and displaying a wise discretion and polished humanitas, might well serve as a prototype of the Christian bishop, and his entourage of presbyters, deacons, and others, all working for the spiritual well-being (salus) of the Christian community. The governor himself, easy to approach at all hours, 'in season and out of season' (2 Ti 4<sup>2</sup>), not only in his court-house, but even in his bedroom (cubiculum, 8. 3); listening to the troubles of his people, careful to avoid the least breath of scandal, and the slightest attempt at bribery, a sort of 'divine man' dropped down from heaven into the province (ii. 7), in whose eyes the safety, children, reputation, and property of his subjects are the dearest things on earth (iv. 13); discreet in his choice of friends, a wise and fair, grave, self-controlled, humane, stately, cultured gentleman, treating all with generosity and showing hospitality and friendship to those of worthy character—is an admirable picture of what a Church ruler should be. Governors like Ambrose of Milan, who fashioned their lives according to Cicero's sketch, proved the best bishops after the standard of the Pastorals.

The mentality of the writer of the Pastorals is Roman in the highest sense, according to the highest Roman traditions, such as the outlook of one would become who had realized through contact with pure Romans the superiority of their 'gravitas' and 'pietas' to the levity and insincerity of the Greeks, and the value of his own citizenship as a Roman in the greatest empire on earth.

There are some one hundred and sixty words and phrases in the Pastorals which are distinctly Latin. We can substitute disciplina (= disciplinā) for διδασκαλία (sing.) in every passage, the former being used both of instruction and system. We have the Latin introduction to a proverb 'verum illud verbum,' in πῖστος ὁ λόγος (the article is rarely found because the Latin has none). Δι' ἡν αἰτίαν, almost peculiar to the Pastorals in NT, frequently in Diodorus Siculus, the Latin-Greek writer, represents quam ob rem or causam; χάριν ἔχω is the Latin 'gratiam habeo,' also in Diodorus, etc. With Jesus 'our hope' (1 Ti 1<sup>1</sup>) compare Scipio 'our every hope' ('spem omnem,' Livy, 28. 39). The τῦνες, of contempt, several times in Pastorals, is the Latin 'quidam,' used in same way (Terence, Eun. iii. 2. 20). 'In me the gods showed all their power' (Terence, Eun. v. 8. 3). 'In me Christ Jesus showed all patience' (1 Ti 1<sup>16</sup>). πᾶς all



through represents the Latin *summus* (Tit 2<sup>15</sup>), 'rebuken with supreme (πάσης) authority'; cf. Cicero, *Att.* i. 17. 8, 'I rebuked the Senate *cum summâ auctoritate*.' 'Sinners of whom I am first' (πρώτος) recalls 'princes sceleris' (Cicero, Cluent). 'This is right and acceptable' (ἰ Ti 2<sup>3</sup>) is the 'gratum acceptumque' of Cicero. Women *professing* godliness or religion (of ἰ Ti 2<sup>10</sup>) are in contrast to the 'professae,' the women whose calling was afterwards described by Tacitus as a 'professio flagitii' (*Ann.* ii. 85), and who were debarred from the καταστολή, or long robe. The writer even attempted to put Horace's 'non erubescendus' into Greek (2 Ti 2<sup>15</sup>). It is the Latin that helps to explain 2 Ti 2<sup>15</sup>, as driving a straight furrow in the field of truth, for the ploughman must not *praevaricare* (Pliny, 18. 19). The confusion between 'elder' (presbyter) of age and 'elder' (presbyter) of office in ἰ Ti 5<sup>1</sup> and 5<sup>17</sup> is not in the Latin, which has 'senior' in the former and 'presbyteri' in the latter. The confusion between 'deacon' of office in ἰ Ti 3<sup>8</sup> and διάκονος in the sense of servant of Christ (ἰ Ti 4<sup>9</sup>) is not in the Latin, which here has 'minister' and there 'diaconi.' Their word will spread as a *gangrene* (2 Ti 2<sup>17</sup>), a metaphorical expression found in Varro (26 B.C.). 'Quippe qui,' seeing that, or inasmuch as, underlies ὅστις on the six occasions. The difficult passage (2 Ti 2<sup>20</sup>), the firm *themelios* of God *standeth* having this seal, 'the Lord knoweth,' etc., where a 'foundation' which always 'lies' elsewhere here stands, may be explained as a boundary stone, a *terminus* or *cippus* which stood erect, and often bore an inscription (Horace, S. 2. 6. 38). See Ovid, *Fasti*, ii., where the stone itself is called 'Terminus,' dividing one field from another. Here there is a division made by the *themelios* between the Lord's people and those who are not. The Romans sealed letters and things. We have *membranae*, *paenula* (2 Ti 4<sup>11</sup>), *aniles fabellae* (Hor.) in γραῶδεις μῦθοι (ἰ Ti 4<sup>7</sup>), *irrepere* of insidious entry in ἐνδύνοντες (2 Ti 3<sup>6</sup>), and numerous other phrases in which a Latin word may lurk.

Furthermore, in the grand sonorous passages (2 Ti 3, ἰ Ti 1<sup>5-20</sup>) there is more of Cicero than Demosthenes. In the Pastorals and in the Orations of Cicero we have the same piling up of crimes, the same intensive accumulation of sinister attributes. In his lurid but vivid pictures of Catiline, Antony, Dolabella, and Verres, Cicero is unsurpassed. His mordant tongue eventually lost him his head. Antony would not forget. And yet the passage that most resembles *Philippic*, iii. 14, 'nostis insolentiam Antonii,' etc., is 2 Ti 3<sup>1-9</sup>. Albeit more refined, it is an equally awful picture, and expressed in similar

sonorous sesquipedalian words. We see the stealthy entrance of the false teachers, under the semblance of the religion whose reality they have forsworn, into the homes of women, women who have had a baneful past, but are struggling out into the light, just to be dragged back into hell and darkness. On the other hand, we are in the stately hall of Varro, a home of study, a treasury of art, and one of Antony's banquets is in progress; it is a scene of profligacy, abandonment, and temptation and 'madness,' the very word Paul used of the false teachers. By the side of the list of crimes, each with an awful picture behind it, in ἰ Ti 1<sup>9</sup>, we can place the descriptions of *Catiline*, ii. 4. The parallels are striking. For Nero, matricide, parricide, murderer, impurest and wickedest of men, and his boon companions, men of finish but of vice, were like Catiline and his crew, 'opposed to sound moral teaching.' On the other hand, we have charming pictures in Cicero of stately homes, great ladies of high reputation, delightful children, kind-hearted gentlemen like Lepidus (*Phil.* 13. 4), and a most virtuous discipline, 'sanctissima disciplina,' like that of Pompey (*Phil.* 2. 28). Such pictures may have suggested to Paul that the children of the clergy, inferior and higher, might be equally 'optatissimi,' their wives equally 'probatissimae,' and their home discipline equally 'sanctissima.' But it is in Cicero's letters that we find the most numerous and striking parallels to the Pastorals. A few may be mentioned here. Tiro, like Timothy, was delicate, both being κακοστόμαχος. As Paul prescribed wine for Timothy, Cicero prescribed it for Tiro. Paul had a weakness for Timothy. He was aware that he was criticised for appointing one so young. Cicero appointed Caelius his quaestor to take charge of Asia until the new consul arrived. 'Puerum, inquires, et fortasse fatuum et non gravem, et non continentem,' (*Att.* vi. 6), 'a foolish youth neither σεμνός nor σώφρων (cf. Tit 2<sup>2</sup>), you will say. But the appointment suited my old age.' Paul 'the aged' would have made the same excuse. With Paul's friendship for the youthful Timothy, compare Cicero's affection for Marcus Marcellus (*Fam.* xv. 9), 'I hear that in all your sayings, actions, studies, and pursuits you are like me'; cf. 2 Ti 3<sup>10</sup> ('omnibus dictis factis studiis, institutis'). Paul praised Timothy for following his instruction, way of life, purpose, faith, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ. With Paul's interest in Timothy's improvement (ἰ Ti 4<sup>15</sup>), cf. Cicero (*Fam.* xv. 16a), where, writing to his son, he says, 'I have just had a letter which shows that he is making progress' (same word προκοπή). We have



ten compounds with *φίλο-* in Pastorals, twenty-four in Cicero's letters, forty-nine compounds with *ἀ-* in Pastorals, sixty in Cicero's letters, and some of both are the same. We have snippets of quotations from Homer and others in Cicero's letters, as we have in Paul's writings. Paul requested Titus to show attention to Zenas and Apollos, and see that nothing was lacking that they required (Tit 3<sup>13</sup>). Cicero (*Att.* xi. 3. 2) says of a parting guest, 'look after him and see that nothing is lacking that he requires.' Cicero had a penchant for 'conceit,' *τῦφος, τετυφῶσθαι*, etc. Paul used the verb three times in Pastorals only. Cicero says (*Att.* 16. 2. 6), 'You say that you will winter in Epirus,' and requests Atticus to come there. Paul says, 'Hasten to come to me at Nicopolis (in Epirus), for there I intend to

winter' (Tit 3<sup>13</sup>). With the double invitation, 'Hasten to come to me,' 'hasten to come to me before winter' (2 Ti 4<sup>9, 21</sup>), compare the reiterated invitations to Atticus (iii. 25), 'Try to be with me, wherever I am, before the kalends of July' (iii. 26). 'I pray you hasten to come to me' (iv. 1. 8), 'I am waiting for you, and I beg of you to hasten to come.' In the three following letters he repeats it.

As last century saw the rehabilitation of the correspondence of Cicero with Brutus attacked by Tunstall (1741), Markland, Niebuhr (1828), and many others, and defended by Hermann, Muller, Tyrrell, and Purser, this century may witness the rehabilitation of the Pastoral Epistles, whose authenticity has been as stoutly defended as vigorously assailed.

## Literature.

### THE WISDOM LITERATURE.

PROFESSOR C. F. KENT did not live to complete his great and finely conceived scheme of 'The Student's Old Testament, Logically and Chronologically Arranged and Translated,' of which five volumes have already appeared. Fortunately, however, the single volume on *Proverbs and Didactic Poems* (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net) necessary to complete the series existed in Professor Kent's manuscript to the extent of about two-thirds; and it has been very successfully completed by Dr. Millar Burrows, of Brown University, a pupil and friend of Professor Kent, who has caught not only his spirit but his method, so that the present volume is as nearly as may be what Dr. Kent would have wished it to be.

Besides dealing with Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Job, which are translated in full into vigorous modern English, it presents in the Introduction a general discussion of the Wisdom Literature with its Babylonian and, more particularly, Egyptian affiliations, and one chapter offers a fine appreciation, with apt illustrative quotations, of Ben Sira, who, however, is not translated. The Book of Proverbs is arranged, much as in Professor Kent's little volume on 'The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and their Proverbs,' published over thirty years ago, according to subject-matter, so that one can see at a glance its teaching on any of the topics discussed—a great convenience to the preacher and to the

student of Israel's ethical thought. Ecclesiastes, which Kent believes to be influenced by the older Babylonian philosophy, presupposes a Greek atmosphere and is set in the years immediately following 200 B.C. Its unabashed pessimism, which is that of extreme old age, is attacked in interpolations which represent about a fourth of the present book. In the introductory discussion to Job a suggestive comparison is instituted between Job and the Babylonian King Tabi-utul-Bel, with whose story Job has many affinities if also many differences. The value of the Book of Job, as an appeal to the sorely harassed Jewish nation of the post-exilic period, is suggestively brought out. This 'lyric drama,' as the writer calls it, in which God, rather than Job, is on trial, is set about 450 B.C., and though the problem with which the book deals is kept within the limits of this earthly life, Dr. Kent believes that it 'reveals the birth-pangs of the belief in a personal immortality.' It is good that Professor Kent's monumental work, carried through for so many years with such unflagging industry, should have been brought to completion by the hands of a scholar so competent and sympathetic as Dr. Burrows.

### MORALS IN REVIEW.

The aim of the treatise—*Morals in Review*, by Dr. A. K. Rogers (Macmillan; 15s. net)—is thus stated by the author: 'What I have set out to do



is not to reproduce everything that philosophers have said about ethics, but to isolate the more significant contributions which have left a definite mark, especially as these are still relevant to discussions at the present day.' Dr. Rogers is well qualified for a work of this kind, for he has already proved by his numerous books on philosophy and ethics his scholarship and his judgment in this field. It is a liberal education in the history of ethical speculation for the reader to follow him in his review from Socrates down through the centuries to Leslie Stephen and our own day. In such a wide field the difficulties of significant selection are very great, and perhaps no two thinkers equally conversant with the subject-matter would on all points and persons agree, but it is safe to say that in this volume the really significant thinkers are handled, and their merits and defects judiciously considered in the light of their age.

There is such a calm air of sanity pervading the volume and such an obvious desire for impartiality of treatment that it may appear monotonous to the reader, until he remembers that the questions of morality here dealt with are of such importance that any cheap excursions after sensational novelty are out of place. The writer is not here a moral reformer or ethical preacher, but a judicial historian, and he maintains this rôle throughout. This may to some make the book less interesting and picturesque, but it is therefore not the less important. The only chapter that may arouse mild astonishment is that on Mandeville, the once notorious author of 'The Fable of the Bees' (1670-1733). Dr. Rogers is conscious of the need of some justification for giving a whole chapter to this writer, and he calls it 'Moral Realism—a Digression,' but the reader has no cause of complaint, though he may still have doubts if such a satirist is to be taken so seriously and so copiously when others are so limited for space.

To the reader interested in religion it is perhaps disappointing, even if he feels it to be inevitable, that only fourteen pages are explicitly given to 'Church Ethics,' and these wholly taken up with Thomas Aquinas; but on more careful reading he cannot help observing that the writer is aware of the influence of Christianity on morals, though even on the grounds of judicial historic insight this influence might have been more generously treated, both in the way of recognizing its enrichment of the ethical ideal and in the way of supplying a reasonable and lovable authority to the moral agent—to say nothing of its inspiration for the acquisition of moral strength and the deliver-

ance of the conscience from its sense of guilt and weakness.

After an exposition of four hundred and forty-six pages the writer gives us five pages of a Postscript in which he states his conclusions. Through all ethical speculation he sees a conflict between the claims of authority and the claims of freedom. To pacify these—giving weight and worth to each—is largely the task of morals and the condition of moral progress. Whether it be the rigorous demand of keeping the volume within reasonable limits, or the meticulous timidity of a scholar, that hindered him from a more thorough judicial summing up and a more constructive programme, we cannot say, but we feel that most readers will regret the exiguousness of this part of the book, especially in view of the obvious and striking merits of the historical exposition. This historical exposition itself—which is the main object of the volume—is excellently done, alike in its selection, its treatment, and its critical quality. They will value it most who best know the difficulty of the task, and their verdict, if we are not mistaken, will be that this is a clear and trustworthy review of morals worthy of all praise.

#### THE PROBLEM OF THE GOSPELS.

Professor Burton Scott Easton, of the General Theological Seminary, New York, whose commentary on St. Luke was so favourably received, has written a useful and significant volume on the modern subject of form-criticism as applied to the problem of the Gospels. *The Gospel before the Gospels* (Scribners; \$1.75) is the title, and the aim is to establish by purely historical considerations the general reliability of the tradition about Jesus. In the furtherance of this aim the author begins with a brief sketch of the history of the study of the Synoptic problem since the dawn of the present century. We are now beginning, as he says, to reach the separate paragraphs that lie behind our documents and that were transmitted to the first Christian authors by oral means. These are the final data of the literary investigation, and it is with these that the form-criticism of the Gospels is concerned.

Initiated by Dibelius in 1919, who grappled determinedly with the question of the separate paragraphs, the subject of form-criticism has been receiving attention at the hands of Gunkel, Bultmann, Bertram, C. F. Burney, and others. In 1924 Fascher discussed the limits of the method in question.

Having concluded his historical retrospect with Fascher, Dr. Easton proceeds: 'Paradigms, stories, legends, cult-legends, epiphanies, apothegms, miracles, parables, folk-tales, controversies, dialogues, parenesis, logia, prophetic and apocalyptic utterances, church rules, sayings in the first person, allegories, poem stanzas—the research of the past decade has exhibited no poverty of terminology! But how profitable is it all? Can we really analyse forms with such precision as to make form-criticism a true discipline?' He is persuaded that, despite its limitations, the new discipline merits our full attention, if only as bringing us in contact with the earliest Christian pedagogy. But he is also persuaded that it can carry us farther than this; though it must not be regarded as historical criticism, it may prepare the way for historical criticism.

Applying the tests whereby beliefs of the Synoptic period can be distinguished with certainty from the teachings of Jesus, Dr. Easton finds the former to be most scantily supported by sayings placed in Jesus' mouth, and concludes that, so far as the sayings are concerned, the Synoptic perspective is genuine: 'The primary historic value of the Synoptists is not for their own age but for the tradition of the teachings of Jesus.' It is not that every verse and clause of the tradition is guaranteed, but that the chief criteria for the detection of foreign elements must be derived from the sayings themselves, and not from outside considerations. That there are legendary and mythical elements in the Synoptic tradition Dr. Easton is prepared to admit; yet at the most these stories simply heighten the impression that the Jesus of history actually produced.

#### HANDBOOK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Mr. R. B. Henderson, M.A., Headmaster of Alleyn's School, Dulwich, has much experience in teaching the Old Testament to Sixth Form boys, and in his *Modern Handbook to the Old Testament* (Christophers, London; 4s. 6d. net) he presents the results of that experience. His book traverses practically every aspect of the Old Testament—its history, its literature with the ultimate constituent documents, its literary idiom, its theology, etc.—with the result that, though much useful information is conveyed, the general effect is rather discursive. We are sure that any one taught by Mr. Henderson would be left in no kind of doubt as to the living quality of Old Testament literature and history; there would not be

many dull moments in his classroom; he is not afraid to suggest, for example, that Moses would have been horrified by the sacrificial system of Leviticus and all the religious ideas for which it stood. And similar courageous utterances abound.

But that is just the trouble. The book is written under the very powerful influence, which the author gratefully acknowledges, of Professor Kennett, whose pupil he was. Now while Dr. Kennett is a master of Old Testament science, he can hardly be called representative. On nearly all the big questions he goes his own way, which indeed is rather a lonely way. So we find in this volume statement after statement which would be challenged by four Old Testament scholars out of five, and even the results about which there is a broad consensus of scholarship frequently find no mention here. Our criticism is not that 'moderate' views should be preferred to 'advanced,' but that in a book intended partly for boys it might have been better to present the literary history in the form which is more or less commonly accepted. Indeed, the force of Mr. Henderson's presentation would be better understood by those who had gone through this preliminary drill.

For example, he dates the compilation of E as between 670 and 600, and of J as between 621 and 604. He places the redacted JE in the years immediately following 586 (about 581), while D is between 550 and 520. The passages in which Samuel seems to favour the idea of a monarchy are set about Zerubbabel's time, while those which deprecate that idea come probably after the time of Nehemiah. The reformation of Josiah is believed to precede the publication of Deuteronomy; the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah is to be equated with the persecuted Hasidim and therefore relegated to the Maccabæan period; many of the psalms belong to the second century, while in the Psalter 'seldom will anything quite unmistakably pre-exilic be discovered.' All these statements would be fiercely challenged and some of them roundly denied by not a few of the most competent Old Testament scholars of the day; and it seems a pity that a view of the history and literature should be presented to boys which would be disowned by much of the best contemporary scholarship. The book, however, is alive and stimulating, and it is capable of doing better service for those who are acquainted with the current critical view of the Old Testament than it seems likely to do for those for whose use it was intended.



## JOHN BUNYAN.

It is fitting that the year 1928, being the tercentenary of the birth of John Bunyan, should see a revival of interest in his immortal work. Perhaps it is inappropriate to speak of a revival of interest, for the Dreamer and his Pilgrim are always with us. Two excellent short biographies have come to hand. The first is *John Bunyan: Pilgrim and Dreamer*, by Mr. William Henry Harding (Oliphants; 3s. 6d. net). The writer has long been known in evangelical circles by his life of Müller of Bristol and his edition of Finney's Lectures on Revival, and this posthumous work on Bunyan will do something to keep alive his memory. It is well written and interesting, while it breathes a warm and devout spirit throughout. All the facts of Bunyan's life which are ever likely to come to light have long since been put on record, and the industry of that prince of editors, George Offor, has left little to be elucidated. Nothing remains but to set down the known facts in a fresh and telling way. This Mr. Harding has done. A single error may be noted. November 30, 1628, is the date of Bunyan's baptism, not of his birth, the exact date of which is unknown.

The second biography is *John Bunyan: His Life and Times*, by the Rev. R. Winboul Harding, B.D. (Sharp; 2s. 6d. net). It is built on a different plan and might be regarded as supplementing the first. It does not deal so fully with the details of Bunyan's life, but gives on the one hand a really illuminating picture of his times and of the Puritan spirit, while on the other hand it devotes considerable space to a fine discussion of the Pilgrim's Progress as a masterpiece of literature, a work of art, and a religious classic. The work is done with great taste and insight, and the Personality of Bunyan is made to stand out with much clearness.

The Religious Tract Society have issued a tercentenary edition of the *Pilgrim's Progress* (6d. net). It is beautifully printed in unusually large type, with an attractive paper cover and several full-page coloured illustrations after Copping. It is a marvellous sixpence worth, but it is a pity that it contains only Part I. of the Progress and that the beautiful cover is too fragile for common use. It ought to have a wide circulation.

A dramatic version of the *Pilgrim's Progress* has been arranged by Mr. William Rix (Allen & Unwin; 2s. net). The main outline of the story is skilfully presented, and the situations are handled with considerable success. Full directions are given as to dress and staging. It would be a fine undertaking for any Church Guild or Young People's Society to

present the drama in the coming winter—a difficult task certainly, but most educative.

## CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE.

*Christianity and the State*, by the Right Rev. William Temple, Bishop of Manchester (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net), is one of the series of Scott Holland Lectures, dealing with the religious sanctions of social and political life. Dr. Temple, as all know, is widely read in classical and historic sociology. He is in close touch with the problems of industry, as a Bishop of Manchester can hardly fail to be. He is a master of emphatic and fluent speech. The result is that this book is a rapid, allusive, open-minded survey of many centuries, with most interesting characterizations and comments. But it seldom reaches undeniable conclusions. His pages are too few to allow him to summarize adequately sociology from Plato to Karl Marx, with a look in on the minds of a host of writers, including Machiavelli, Spinoza, and Hobbes, as he passes on. A well-read man would find it sketchy. The average reader is not enlightened. He begins by maintaining the thesis that the modern State must be Christian, based on the reality of God, and functioning through faith in Him. The fact of Christ is not often mentioned. He translates this basis into four 'principles'—the Sanctity of Personality, the Fact of Fellowships, the Obligation of Service, consummating in Sacrifice. These necessitate community, and the State is the 'organ of community.' Its authority is expressed in Law, and must be maintained by Force. Thereby order, well-being, and liberty are maintained. Thus a definition is reached: 'The State is the necessary organ of the national community, maintaining through Law—as promulgated by a government endowed to this end with coercive power—the universal conditions of social order' (p. 123). It is this State which has authority over the other 'cohesions' of Society—'the family, trade union, church, and the rest.'

From this position the writer proceeds to touch with verve and vivacity on the issues of the day. Facing two of the urgent questions, he suggests the creation of Industrial and Educational Parliaments, without fearing that these might become magnified, selfish, and more potent and defiant Trade Unions. With a generally adverse attitude to war, he reaches the verdict of its lawfulness and necessity on occasions. Now and again, on other present-day questions there are sentences which seem to disclose a mind not wholly resolved. In discussing the question of private property, he writes: 'A Chris-

tian Sociology will desire that every citizen should possess enough property to support bare life, even though he does no stroke of work for it ; for so his work and service will be more nearly free, and personality will have a fuller scope ' (p. 98). That does not seem to be in accord with either the ethics of Christ or of Paul. But a broader criticism questions some of his more fundamental positions. The State is not to be defined as an 'organ' of the community. An 'organ' has no independent will. The State is an organism, which, in some forms, has been independent of the community. It is not a construction, as Dr. Temple clearly proves, yet it is not a 'growth' as he maintains. It is an evolution. A growth from a seed or a root is a different thing from an evolution. Ever and again he comes into touch with the neglected truth, that the Christian State is an evolution from the family. Its principles are not the four given such prominence here. They are justice, truth, mercy, goodwill, consummating in goodwill's highest form of love. Motivated by these, the State will become not only the Kingdom of God, but the Family of God the Father, here and now on earth—and, as the prophets affirm, for evermore. That is the conclusion Bishop Temple desires.

After publishing a series of commentaries which covers the whole range of the Old Testament, Canon Sell in a new volume takes up the task of explaining the significance of *The Talmud, Mishnah and Midrash* (Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square, London ; 1s. 6d.). This volume displays the same power as the commentaries of getting to the heart of a complicated problem and saying about it just the things that matter. While Canon Sell is a very learned man, he does not allow his learning to be smothered by pedantry or even to be obtruded at all ; he has the gift of speaking to the plain man in a way that he can understand. So here we find much valuable information, clearly put, about the Targums, etc., and the wisdom of the Canon is shown in devoting most of his space to a discussion of the Midrash, whose often fantastic quality he vividly sets forth in numerous illustrations. Against these we can appreciate more than ever the wonderful sanity of the Bible. A section is also devoted to the heretical 'Minim' and to some of the doctrinal views represented by the Rabbinical literature. This volume is a worthy supplement to Canon Sell's series of commentaries.

*The Deed and the Doom of Jesus* (T. & T. Clark ; 1s. 6d.), by Mr. Francis Herbert Stead, M.A., purports to provide a new line of approach to the theory of the Atonement. Mr. Stead regards the old images and approaches as obsolescent, and is of the opinion that for terms sacrificial or commercial, feudal or governmental, we should substitute nowadays more immediate terms of the mind itself. Accordingly, he examines the bearing on the experience of Jesus of the Law of Habit, in which the constancy of God expresses itself as succession, and of the Law of Reciprocity, in which it expresses itself as co-existence. These two Laws are represented as making inevitable the sufferings of Jesus as One who broke through the racial habit of sin, freeing men from the power and penalty in it, and who was also the perfect embodiment of reciprocity, maintaining His loyalty and sensitiveness in a sinful world, and rousing thereby a response of new sensitiveness and loyalty. But, even so, we fail to see that Mr. Stead has made any real contribution to the theory of the Atonement. We should add that his essay is none the less interesting and readable.

The Rev. Paul P. Levertoff, author of several learned contributions to Biblical scholarship, has published in pamphlet form under the title *St. Paul in Jewish Thought* (Diocesan House, London ; 2s.) three lectures delivered, on the invitation of the Bishop of London, at the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields in September 1927. The lectures were attended by a mixed audience of Jews and Christians. The first lecture, 'St. Paul and his Jewish Contemporaries,' finds a direct polemic against St. Paul in Midrash Sifre, and contrasts with it the view of St. Paul given by the late Dr. Schiller-Szinessy of Cambridge. The second lecture is on 'Claude Montefiore's Criticism and Appreciation of St. Paul' ; and the third is on 'A Jewish Dramatist's Presentation of St. Paul,' being an account (reprinted from 'Theology') of Franz Werfel's 'Paulus unter den Juden.' An appendix treats of the Russian philosopher Soloviev's views on Judaism and Christianity.

It was a good idea of Mr. G. R. Holt Shafto and Mr. A. Gordon James to link together the names of *Moses and Jesus* in their study of the Decalogue (Epworth Press ; 3s. 6d. net). Their book, which rests on the belief that human society must have a religious basis and that the Decalogue is a fundamental document of sociology, is in effect a discussion of the Decalogue in the light of the New



Testament. The discussion is not concerned with its historical origin, but with its sociological implications, as a guide to the excellent way of fellowship with God and man, without which the ideal human society is unattainable. It is pointed out that characteristically Jesus is more interested in the precepts of 'probity' than of 'piety.' The Commandments are taken *seriatim*, explained in their original intention, and then set forth in the deeper meaning elicited from them by Jesus.

The writers keep the modern world steadily in view and drop many wise *obiter dicta*. For example, on the eighth Commandment, 'A just economic order can only be brought about by the co-operation of persons, not by the redistribution of things.' On the sixth, 'War in general cannot be justified by the teaching of Jesus. The final guarantee of international peace is' not pacts, treaties, and leagues, but 'the recognition by the community of the supreme necessity of fostering fellowship and encouraging a spirit of goodwill.'

*The Religious Basis of Citizenship* (Epworth Press ; 2s. 6d. net) is an enlargement of a number of addresses by Mr. V. Donald Siddons, D.F.C., B.A., to a Summer School at High Leigh, Hertfordshire, where a group of young men and women of the Wesleyan Methodist Church met in a conference on social questions. It is an examination and interpretation of the witness by the Scriptures to a religious ideal of citizenship, with some attention to the post-apostolic conception of society. Beginning with an estimate of the basis to be discerned in the Old Testament, it enters more inquiringly into the mind of the New Testament believers. It faces the problem raised by the illusory hopes of the early Christian Church as to the coming of the Kingdom and its King. It closes, after stressing the universality of the Kingdom of God, with a discussion of its demands upon the political and social life of Christian men, and a statement of the ideal as that of citizenship busy in the building of the City of God. Its English style is clear and concise, and its accent of moral earnestness falls pleasantly on the mental ear. It is easy to understand the impression these addresses made on the company of young believers who accepted their premises, and were roused to chivalrous enthusiasm for their ideal. But the writer seems at times to be too much under the sway of one or two of the many authorities he cites. That seems most evident in two regards. The first is as to the social function of the Church. That depends largely on its environment. It was one

thing in the early centuries. It is another in a heathen land of to-day. It is another within the British Isles. In the other regard the thought of the City is sometimes regarded as simply a city, to whose service there is a first call to a young believer. But the 'City of God' is really a figure drawn from past ages when city-states, such as Jerusalem and Athens, held men's allegiance, not to their civic life but to their wide *imperium*. Yet the ideal here presented holds, and it would be more potent with a wider application. As a reader closes the volume, he wonders where Christ comes in. There is no clear statement as to His place and office in the City of God.

*The Book and the Vote*, by Bishop Herbert Hensley Henson, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 2s. 6d. net), is a collection of recent sermons and articles promoted by the Prayer Book discussions. The organization of the National Church as an autonomous denomination by the 'Enabling Act' of 1919 and the recent conflict between the autonomous Church and the House of Commons have combined to create a situation which may compel the Bishop of Durham to reverse his policy of a lifetime and to favour disestablishment with concomitant disendowment, as the only course consistent with the Church's self-respect: 'That the Church, Clergy and Laity, united in corporate action, should be controlled in spiritual matters [that is, in the Revision of the Prayer Book] by an authority which is not Christian offends Protestants not less than other Christians.' 'In the Enabling Act of 1919 an attempt was made to effect a *modus vivendi* between a secularized State and a denominational Church. The action of the House of Commons on December 15th, 1927, registers the failure of that attempt, and reveals a situation of fundamental discord between Church and State.'

By the various statements brought together in this volume Dr. Henson endeavours to explain the actual changes effected by the revision of the Prayer Book and to urge their acceptance by the Church and the nation. The articles on 'The Composite Book' and 'The Passing of National Churches' have already appeared in journals ; of the five other items here printed, the sermons on 'Church and State in England' and on 'Civilization and Christianity' are less immediately topical than the rest.

We do not think that Dr. Henson, closely as he keeps himself in touch with ecclesiastical movements in Scotland, is right in coupling together as

he does the 'Enabling Act' of 1919 and the Church of Scotland Act of 1921. It may be that both Acts are 'in principle' Acts of disestablishment, but it can hardly be said of the Scottish Church, in view of the more recent legislature concerning the 'temporalities,' that 'disestablishment *eo nomine* is postponed because it would necessitate also disendowment.'

Mr. A. M. Coleman has issued in pamphlet form *The Biblical Text of Lucifer of Cagliari (Acts)* (J. H. Lawrence, Welwyn, Herts). Bishop Lucifer wrote in exile in the East in 355-362, and must have brought his Latin Bible with him. His abundant quotations from Acts are here collated with the text of *gig* (Gigas Holmiensis), with which they are in close agreement.

*Hard Sayings of Jesus* (Lindsey Press; 2s.) is a paper-covered booklet by the Rev. J. Tyssul Davis, B.A., Minister of the Theistic Church, containing seven interesting and suggestive 'talks' on some of the high precepts contained in the Sermon on the Mount and other parts of the record of Jesus' teaching. Mr. Davis acknowledges the moral and religious leadership of Jesus, but repudiates the claims made for Him in the Christian creed. He would set the Christ alongside the Buddha and the other Great Teachers, finding a parallelism of message in them all.

*The Ultimate Epoch, and Other Essays* (Longmans; 6s. net), by Mr. Arthur John Hubbard, M.D., shows a lively interest in New Testament problems, but is of a strangely heterogeneous character. The burden of the first essay is that neither the pursuit of worldly interest nor the exercise of compulsion makes for a permanently satisfactory system of society; what is needed is the Logos in the world, and in Scripture an immense epoch for the future of the Logos in the world is foreshadowed. A contrast to the vague discursiveness of the first essay is furnished by the second, in which it is boldly claimed that an examination of the three records of the storm on the Lake of Galilee shows John, the son of Zebedee ('Boat Owner and Wholesale Fishmonger!') to have been the author of the Fourth Gospel. The third essay affirms that the Gospels represent successive attempts to transmit an adequate record of our Lord's life; while the fourth and concluding essay finds the origin of the custom of early morning communion in the necessity of assembling together, if there was to be any assembling together at all, after the *ergastula* (the

slave-barracks) were opened and before the day's work had begun.

The present position of Old Testament criticism and the main factors which have led up to it are admirably sketched by Professor A. S. Peake in his Lecture on *Recent Developments in Old Testament Criticism* (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net). The Old Testament problem is so intricate and many-sided that this skilful presentation of its main outlines is doubly welcome. Beginning with 1753, when Astruc's famous book raised the Pentateuchal problem, Dr. Peake brings the discussion down to its most recent phases, dealing, for example, in the case of Deuteronomy, with the extreme and contrasted views of Hölischer and Welch. It is reassuring to learn that Professor Peake regards as 'secure' the identification of the Deuteronomic Code with the programme of Josiah's Reformation. The prophets, especially Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, are discussed, also Daniel and the Psalter. Professor Peake joins Hölischer in his opposition to the Maccabæan dating of large sections of prophecy, and he would agree with Gunkel that there is a not inconsiderable pre-exilic element in the Psalter. That Old Testament criticism is, broadly speaking, on the right lines and is not simply producing results which are destined to be overthrown is suggested by Dr. Peake's deliberate summary: 'the net result,' he says, 'of the recent critical movement, it seems to me, is that we are left in the main very much where we were a quarter of a century ago.' To students confused by the mass of critical detail; this discussion, with its clear emphasis upon the salient things, should render a valuable service.

A great deal of useful information, of which the non-professional student of the Bible stands badly in need, is contained in Mr. Conrad A. Skinner's book, *Concerning the Bible* (Sampson Low; 5s. net). He acknowledges his obvious debt to the popular books of Dr. J. Paterson Smyth of Montreal, who honours the book with a Foreword. Mr. Skinner deals with the origin, growth, contents, and inspiration of the Bible in an interesting and racy fashion, tracing the story of the Bible back from the Revised Version through the early English Bibles to the ultimate MSS on which Old Testament and New Testament rest, and giving useful hints as to the nature of J, E, P, and similar matters little known to the average Bible reader. The part of the book that will most help such a reader to a right attitude to the Bible is the discussion of Inspiration and



Authority, where Mr. Skinner makes the point that it is the experiences recorded and not the record of them that is inspired. Mr. Skinner does not conceal his preference for the prophet to the priest : sacrifice he considers 'a base conception at best.' While the prophets were striving to make religion personal and responsible, with the priests 'it is always, "Somebody else."' —

Any book which relates to the Lord's Supper arouses instant and watchful attention to-day. In *The Truth about Fasting*, with especial reference to Fasting-Communion (Rivingtons ; 3s. 6d. net), we have an historical inquiry, as remarkable for its scholarly survey of the evidence of all the Christian centuries, as for its decisive and indefeasible proof of its main declaration. Its author, Professor Percy Dearmer, of King's College, London, is recognized as a master in the history of the early Church, and especially in the records of its worship. Here he begins with a courteous statement of the practical difficulties of fasting at an early hour, so as to partake of the elements after such a prescription. Then he summons up the evidence against it, drawn from the teachers of all the Christian ages, and presents an amazing succession of witnesses. Three especially notable instances may be cited. The first is the neglect, almost desertion, of communion by the English people. 'The spectacle has become common of an early service, at which in a parish of many thousands there are present some twenty women, and two or three men, with the working classes unrepresented, except for a few servant girls.' 'The Bishop of Southwark stated that the communicants in his diocese were less than 5 per cent.' The early hour, to secure Fasting-Communion, has been the powerful factor in this decrease. The second is the fresh and convincing examination of Pliny's Letter to Trajan, which, as Professor Dearmer shows, when quoted as a whole, has no reference at all to early communion. The third is the roll of evidence he unfolds from those who have given Fasting-Communion no special sanction. Even Pusey writes : 'There is no irreverence in non-fasting communion. In some cases there would be a direct conflict between our Lord's command and the observance of this pious custom.' But the final argument is that this demand rests upon a materialistic view of the elements, against which the Church of England has made its protest, as the evidence adduced clearly proves, down all the centuries.

Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. have added three

more volumes to their handy and lavishly illustrated 'Things Seen' Series of travel guide-books (3s. 6d. net). These deal with *Things Seen in Madeira*, by J. Edith Hutcheon, F.R.G.S. ; *Things Seen in the Dolomites*, by L. M. Davidson, F.R.G.S. ; and *Things Seen in the Bay of Naples*, by A. G. Mackinnon, M.A. The writers not only know their subjects thoroughly, but can deal with them with the appreciation of enthusiasts and the further attraction of an admirable literary style. To those who can spend the time and the money, each of these territories has its own peculiar attractions. Those who have neither the time nor the money may nevertheless spend many pleasant hours in an arm-chair in most enjoyable company. They may stand on the edge of the crater of Vesuvius and look into the boiling and steaming abyss, with no risk of being overcome by the sulphurous fumes. Mr. Mackinnon, who writes of the enchantments around the Bay of Naples, is one of the best of guides.

The Rev. David Ross Fotheringham, M.A., F.R.A.S., Vicar of Charing, has written a little book on *The Date of Easter and other Christian Festivals* (S.P.C.K. ; paper 1s. 6d., cloth 2s. 6d.). Lord Desborough, who brought forward a Bill in 1921 fixing Easter for the Second Sunday in April, writes a commendatory preface. In the first three sections of the book the dates of our Lord's Nativity, Baptism, and Crucifixion are considered in the light of the documentary evidence ; and in the last section the exclusion of the Lunar calendar is advocated, and the appointment of April 9th as the basic date for a fixed or stabilized Easter. Obviously Mr. Fotheringham handles his subject with competence, and that it is a subject of topical interest as well as of importance is evidenced by the fact that in 1926 a Committee of the League of Nations recommended that Easter should be 'the Sunday following the second Saturday in April'—with which Mr. Fotheringham's proposal is in agreement.

*God and His Works* (S.P.C.K. ; paper 2s. 6d., cloth 3s. 6d.) is No. 40 of the publishers' 'Texts for Students.' It consists of selections from Part I. of the 'Summa Theologica' of St. Thomas Aquinas. These have been arranged by the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., who also supplies an Introduction, in which the question is discussed whether St. Thomas is a Platonist or an Aristotelian. The arrangement of the material is clear and orderly, and the understanding of the text is facilitated by

the explanatory notes and references here and there given. In these days of renewed interest in the writings of St. Thomas the publication of this little work is very timely.

It has been the fashion of late to trace much of the thought and institutions of early Christianity to the influence of foreign contemporary cults, and more particularly of the mystery religions. In *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments* (S.P.C.K. ; 5s.), Professor F. Gavin, Ph.D., Th.D., of the General Theological Seminary, New York, argues powerfully for the influence of Jewish rather than Gentile thought upon the sacraments. While we do not normally associate sacramentalism with the Jewish religion, its view of matter as not only not inherently evil but as the creation and in some sense a revelation of God involves a sort of essential, if not explicitly acknowledged, sacramentalism. 'The essential germinal principles of a sacramental outlook on the universe were not only tolerated by Judaism, but even lay intimately at its centre.'

The Jewish antecedents of Baptism and the Eucharist are then fully discussed and the many parallels between Jewish and Christian usage are so set forth that some intimate connexion seems undeniable. Both Baptism and the Eucharist are of course affected to the core by their relation to Jesus; but while the thought they express is now Christian, the form is Jewish. Many details of both may be found in, or explained by, Jewish practice. The Eucharist, for example, though 'infinitely transcending the customary blessings of Judaism, was yet in its form modelled upon the Common Fellowship Meal of Jewish groups of friends.' This discussion, which explains Christian belief and practice by contemporary Rabbinic Judaism, is a welcome foil to the theory which would account for them by the non-Jewish religious influences prevalent in the Græco-Roman world of the first two centuries.

Any one anxious to acquire an accurate knowledge of Hebrew grammar and syntax and to learn to read a piece of continuous Hebrew prose with an intelligent appreciation of its finer points will find all the help he needs in Professor A. R. S. Kennedy's *The Book of Ruth: The Hebrew Text, with Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary* (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. 6d. net). Every linguistic phenomenon, the easy and the difficult alike, is discussed with admirable lucidity and with constant reference to the relevant paragraphs of Davidson's Grammar, in places even with an almost colloquial fullness, so that to go

carefully through the comments on this finely printed Hebrew text of Ruth is almost as good as having a friendly teacher at one's elbow. Every question that an intelligent student could ask about the grammar, and some that he might not have knowledge enough to ask, is clearly answered here. The book, which is also furnished with a useful vocabulary, is well fitted to give the aspiring student an easy and accurate command of the principal grammatical features of the language.

*George Hay Forbes*, by Principal W. Perry, D.D. (S.P.C.K. ; 7s. 6d. net), is manifestly a labour of love. A biography appearing half a century after the death of its subject, and dealing largely with controversies now utterly forgotten, can hardly hope to be widely read. Yet Canon Perry has done well to have written it. To the eye of the discerning reader the story is one of almost sublime heroism. Here is a boy of noble lineage, a helpless cripple from a child, who not only made himself a great scholar, but printed and published his own writings, discharged the duties of the Christian ministry, and found time withal to act as Provost of a Scottish burgh. In the history of the Scottish Episcopal Church he holds an assured place for his sturdy championship of the Scottish liturgy, and he did much to save his Church from becoming a mere appendage to the Church of England. Canon Perry has done his work with accuracy, care, and sound judgment.

It is the boast of our time that Jesus as an historical figure is better known to us than to any generation since the days of the apostles. Indeed, there seems to be an impression in some minds that even the apostles are not to be excepted, for we are continually being told how imperfectly they understood the Master, and how fragmentary their record of Him is. *The Man of Nazareth*, by Mr. P. I. Painter, B.A. (S.C.M. ; 5s. net), is a study in the personality of Jesus. It is one of that now numerous class of books which have followed in the footsteps of Glover's 'Jesus of History.' It is based on a careful and minute study of the Synoptic Gospels. The narrative is full of colour, imagination, and fine feeling, though at times somewhat fanciful. A section is devoted to the humour of Jesus, of which over a score of examples are offered. One begins to get a little weary of the joke about the camel going down the throat of the Pharisee, hump and all, but here surely we reach the limit when we are invited to see humour in our Lord's description of



the Judgment Day. As usual in such studies the supernatural element is kept well in the background, and the Resurrection as an historical event is ignored. It is a purely human Jesus who is here presented, a genius of the highest order, not a Divine Saviour.

However interesting and instructive such studies are—and there is much here to interest and instruct—this is not the Christ whom the apostles preached and in whom the Church of all ages has believed.

## Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR ARTHUR S. PEAKE, D.D., MANCHESTER.

### III.

I PASS on now to speak of commentaries on the New Testament. We have several commentaries which cover the whole of the Synoptic Gospels. In English we have Bruce (*EGT*) and Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, second edition; in German, Holtzmann (*HC*), E. Klostermann (*HNT*), J. Wellhausen, J. Weiss (*SNT*); and in French, Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. It is curious that some recent British commentators do not mention Bruce at all in their bibliographies. It is quite true that the problems are before us in an altered form, but Bruce had devoted much time and thought to the Synoptic Gospels, and he had the sympathetic insight so precious to the interpreter—much more fully, I think, in his study of the Synoptists than in his study of Paul. There was a largeness about his treatment which was always refreshing, though students whose attention is concentrated on the minutiae of philology and textual criticism will have their needs much better met elsewhere. It would have been a great improvement if Bruce could have reversed the order of the commentaries on Matthew and Mark. As it is, Mark is frequently treated by reference to what has been said on the corresponding passages in Matthew. The reversed order has been followed by Montefiore. His commentary is notable as the interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels by a

liberal Jew, who, while exceptionally sympathetic, remains a Jew. As a contribution to the interpretation of the Gospels from the Jewish side, it is disappointing; but this was to have been supplied by I. Abrahams. He was unable to fulfil the task he had undertaken; but he did succeed in publishing his valuable *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* in two volumes. Montefiore's work is specially full in quotations from continental scholars, in particular, the more extreme. Wellhausen and Loisy were most prominent in the first edition, in the second much attention is paid to Bultmann.

Holtzmann was among the most learned of New Testament scholars, equipped with exceptional knowledge of the relevant literature. He was the master of a very condensed style, and his work is not always easy to read. His standpoint was more advanced than we are accustomed to in Britain, but his work was that of a master of the first rank. J. Weiss also belonged to the more liberal school, but he took his own line, and on some points, and those not unimportant, displayed a welcome freedom from convention. As an exegete I count him among the very foremost of his time. His work on the Synoptic Gospels is popular but firmly grounded on wide knowledge and finished scholarship. It may be convenient to add at this point that he prepared the commentary on the Gospel of Luke in the eighth edition of Meyer. This was replaced in the next edition by a commentary from the pen of his father, B. Weiss. The older scholar thus completed the Synoptists for that series, to which he also contributed the commentaries on John, Romans, and Hebrews. I may accordingly speak about his work in general here. He was a learned and laborious scholar, eminent alike in lower and in higher criticism; a painstaking com-

<sup>1</sup> I use ICC for *International Critical Commentary*, CB for *Cambridge Bible*, Cent. B. for *Century Bible*, West. C. for *Westminster Commentaries*, EGT for *Expositor's Greek Testament*, HC for *Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*, HK for *Handkommentar zum alten Testament*, HNT for Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, KHC for *Kurzer Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, Mey. for Meyer's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, SNT for J. Weiss's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ZK for Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*.

mentator who rarely failed to reach a decision on an exegetical problem, and as rarely failed to regard it as unquestionably right. I am so conscious myself of the even balance of argument in numerous cases and the absence of warrant for any confident decision, that I am constantly amazed at the assurance with which B. Weiss gives his dogmatic judgments. Of the higher exegetical genius such as his gifted son displayed I find little if any trace; but what can be done by unshrinking labour and width of knowledge, that he succeeded in doing.

Wellhausen's commentaries, with which his Introduction to the first three Gospels might be taken, were of quite a different order. These slim volumes, closely packed with matter, fresh and independent, speaking where the author felt he had something of his own to say, silent where he had nothing to add, were everywhere recognized as of the first importance. The most eminent master in the field of Old Testament scholarship, he had much to contribute from his store of Semitic learning, and the skill in critical analysis displayed in his studies of the Hexateuch, Judges, Samuel, and Kings raised high expectations for his critical operations on the Gospels. His radicalism, however, was extreme. Accepting the Two-document theory, he made Q later than Mark and dependent upon it. He regarded its material as the creation of the Jerusalem Church, and believed that Mark had left extremely little authentic matter for his successors to glean. Even in Mark not a little was dismissed as legendary. One whole section was regarded as composed of duplicate narratives. Another section had been 'Christianized' and was therefore largely non-authentic. Thus the genuine tradition was reduced to very slender proportions. Critics generally have failed to follow his lead; but he has given great stimulus to the study of the Gospels and made valuable contributions to the exegesis. I should add that 'Mark,' 'Matthew,' and the 'Introduction' appeared in second editions.

In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, Klostermann's Mark has appeared in a thoroughly revised and expanded edition. I have already explained the general features of this series, and this volume maintains its reputation. The editor has been greatly influenced by Wellhausen.

In French we have Loisy's *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. This massive work of more than eighteen hundred large pages represented a standpoint less extreme than that since reached by the author, but still very radical. It displays very full knowledge of the most important literature, and the

exegetical discussion is thorough. An independent commentary on Mark came out later, and he has recently published a larger volume on Luke. In the latter the author has been much influenced by the study of literary types ('*Formgeschichtliche Methode*'), which has recently been prosecuted with much ardour in Germany, and also by the belief that the Christian cultus exercised great influence on the Gospel narrative. Historical scepticism has gone almost as far as it can go without the denial of the historicity of Jesus. I might also call attention to his translation of the New Testament ('*Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*'), which contains introductions to the separate books and groups of books.

The unfortunate view that Mark was later than Matthew and had drawn largely from him, naturally led to its being the Gospel most neglected by commentators. Now that it is almost universally regarded as the oldest and as the original from which Luke and Matthew largely drew the historical sections they have in common with it, the Second Gospel has attracted the attention of several commentators. Gould in the *ICC* is a serviceable though scarcely a distinguished piece of work, now more than thirty years old. The best commentary in English is Rawlinson (*West. C.*). It is a disadvantage that it is based on the Revised Version and not on the original, and that for a philological treatment it is necessary to go elsewhere. But it is abreast of the critical and exegetical discussion in Germany as well as Great Britain. In particular it is the one commentary on the Gospels which takes full account of the work done on the literary types. It is indeed quite possible that it may be too sympathetic with the exponents of this method, and that the narratives were not originally disconnected stories put together by the author like beads on a string, and therefore not available for any confident reconstruction as to the course of the ministry. But at least the editor tries to bring home the uncertainty of the reconstructions which assume Mark's order to be chronological. And on the exegetical side it is throughout a work of high merit.

In the *Cambridge Greek Testament* we have Plummer. He was a very prolific commentator, writing in the *ICC*, of which he was one of the New Testament editors, on Luke and 2 Corinthians, and completing Robertson's commentary on 1 Corinthians. In the *CGT*, in addition to Mark, he edited John, 2 Corinthians, and the Epistles of John. Early in his career he did Peter and Jude for the *New Testament Commentary for English*



*Readers.* He contributed the volumes on the Pastoral Epistles, James and Jude to the *Expositor's Bible*. He wrote independent commentaries on Matthew, Philippians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians. His exegetical output had accordingly a very wide range. He had been a pupil of Döllinger's and translated some of his books, so he was well equipped on the side of German scholarship. And he wrote also on Church history. His books have considerable merits, wide knowledge of the literature of the subject, sound scholarship, and good sense. But industry, sobriety, and learning do not make a commentator of the first rank, and in the higher and deeper qualities of the heaven-sent exegete it would probably be generally admitted that he was deficient. At the same time for general use his books are often excellent.

Bartlet's Mark (*Cent. B.*) is a great improvement on Salmond, in close contact with foreign as well as British discussions, and marked by considerable independence and freshness. It should be remembered that his solution of the Synoptic problem differs somewhat from that generally accepted; but this does not affect the treatment of Mark so much as of the other Synoptists. To the ill-fated *Oxford Church Commentary* Allen contributed the only New Testament issue which was published before the enterprise came to its regrettable end. He had the very great advantage of being a competent Aramaic scholar, and this gave the commentary a distinction all its own among our British works. It includes a translation in which so far as possible the roughness of Mark's style is retained. The notes are often fresh and suggestive; the main defect of the book—and it is rather serious—is that it is not a good deal fuller.

Of commentaries which do not appear in a series the best known is probably Swete. The author was a very learned scholar who had done much for Biblical study by his manual edition of the Septuagint and by his *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. He was also an accomplished patristic scholar. In textual criticism and Greek scholarship his commentaries are admirable. For the purely exegetical qualities one would pass much the same judgment on his work as on Plummer's.

From these safe, sober, unadventurous, and rather commonplace interpretations we turn with quickened interest to the volumes of Menzies and Bacon. With them we are right out into the full international stream. One may agree with them or disagree with them, but they bring the student into touch with the living problems and treat them in a very stimulating way. *The Earliest*

*Gospel*, by the former of these scholars, did bring a new strain into British treatment of the Gospels. Bacon's *The Beginnings of Gospel Story* opened a series of investigations on the Second Gospel which culminated in his large volume, *The Gospel of Mark*. His critical theories may not command assent, and his treatment of the record may seem unduly sceptical; but he shows great freshness and originality, and his discussion of the individual problems has behind it a coherent theory as to the Gospel history and the development of the literature of primitive Christianity.

Of the German commentaries I have already mentioned those by B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Holtzmann, Klostermann, Wellhausen. There remains Wohlenberg (*ZK*), a painstaking work but not on the level of Zahn's own work or indeed of some other contributors to the series. But it supplies a useful counterweight to some of the more radical expositions.

In French, besides the small volume by Loisy already mentioned, we have a full and excellent Roman Catholic Commentary by Lagrange (1911). It has a very long and thorough introduction, and the commentary itself is very full. The author is an accomplished Semitic scholar and has written an important work on Semitic religions. I may take this opportunity of adding that the commentaries in the same series (*Études Bibliques*) on Matthew, Luke, John, Romans, and Galatians, are all from his hand. As is natural in a French commentary, a good deal of attention is paid to Loisy's views.

On Matthew, Allen (*ICC*) is very thorough so far as the criticism goes, defending a somewhat different theory from that commonly taken. On the exegetical side he is far too meagre, so much so indeed that Plummer wrote his *Exegetical Commentary* in order to make good this deficiency. The volume by B. T. D. Smith (*CB*), just published at last, takes the place of Carr's long, antiquated work. It is within its limits a good piece of work in touch with some of the best recent criticism and exegesis. In view of the Jewish character of the first Gospel it was an excellent idea to entrust the new edition in the *Century Bible* to Box. One could wish that he had had more space, but he has contrived to pack a good deal into it. Micklem (*West. C.*) is on a larger scale and contains much useful matter, but it would have been better if reference to other commentaries had not been excluded. Our foremost commentary is that by McNeile, based on the Greek text and in close contact with the best exegetical literature, foreign as well as British. The author

has the advantage of being also an Old Testament scholar. I may take this opportunity of mentioning the Warburton lectures by Dr. Lukyn Williams—*The Hebrew Christian Messiah* (1916). Strictly this is not in place in an article on Commentaries; but the author's Jewish learning is specially valuable for the exposition of the first Gospel, to which the volume is devoted.

Of foreign commentaries on Matthew, I need not say more on B. Weiss (*Mey.*), Holtzmann (*HC*), Zahn (*ZK*), J. Weiss (*SNT*). I should add, however, that Klostermann (*HNT*) has appeared in a second edition, very thoroughly revised and taking account of fresh investigations down to 1926.

Luke has come off rather badly in British exegesis. Plummer (*ICC*) was published nearly a third of a century ago. It is still the fullest of our modern commentaries. Farrar (*CGT*) was published in 1884; an adequate commentary to replace it in that series has been long overdue. Adeney (*Cent. B.*) has been rather slightly revised for the second edition; it is a useful, popular work. Ragg (*West. C.*) is a good specimen of that series and not too technical. The most recent is the commentary by Easton, a distinguished American scholar. I should personally have preferred a different arrangement of the material, and the strictly exegetical notes are often unduly brief. But it is a thorough piece of work, in constant contact with the best and most recent literature. Adequate attention is given to the lower and higher criticism of the book, and we have at present no commentary to place beside it.

Nothing need be added with reference to the commentaries by Holtzmann (*HC*), B. Weiss (*Mey.*), J. Weiss (*SNT*), Zahn (*ZK*), or Lagrange. Wellhausen was not able to prepare a second edition of this commentary (1904). Klostermann's was written in collaboration with Gressmann (1919); a second edition has not yet appeared.

On the Gospel of John we have no good recent commentary. Bernard in the *ICC* is in the press, though it is unfortunate that the author did not live to see it through. It will no doubt contain much valuable matter, but whether it will prove to be the commentary for which we have been waiting to give us a quite satisfactory exposition cannot be said until we have it before us. Dods (*EGT*) and Plummer (*CGT*) are both serviceable expositions; the latter is one of the better specimens of the author's work. M'Clymont (*Cent. B.*) has been issued in a revised edition (1922). It is conservative on the critical and historical problems,

and a useful aid to the understanding of the Gospel for those who cannot study the larger works.

Westcott published a commentary on the English text in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and for long this was regarded as our standard work. After his death a larger edition was issued, based on the Greek text, and this is much to be preferred. I think it is undeniable, however, that we have drifted a great deal from the attitude towards Westcott which was common thirty years ago. The traditional view as to authorship which Westcott tenaciously held, has been widely abandoned. The Dean of St. Paul's laments Westcott's critical immobility, but speaks of him as 'the one man who among all his contemporaries was best fitted by natural sympathy and understanding to expound the deepest teaching of the Gospel.' He thinks that the more recent commentators, while sounder on the critical problem, had not Westcott's insight into the sublime teaching of John. Other excellent New Testament scholars, however, would demur to this estimate and find much more help for the understanding of the Gospel in some of the recent continental commentaries.

Of these, B. Weiss (*Mey.*) is a favourable specimen of that scholar's work, but the last edition was, I believe, published more than quarter of a century ago. Holtzmann entrusted the revision of his commentary (*HC*) to Walter Bauer, who did the work with great skill and thoroughness. It is one of the best aids from the advanced standpoint to the interpretation of the Gospel. Bauer also did the briefer commentary in *HNT*, which was by no means a mere abbreviation of Holtzmann-Bauer. The second edition of this work which has recently appeared has devoted much attention to Mandæan parallels. I understand that Bultmann is preparing the new edition of John for Meyer. In this we may be sure that great prominence will be given to Mandæan affinities, since the editor has already called special attention to them and put forward a radical theory of primitive Christianity to account for them. The student will be wise to exercise a good deal of caution on this point. Zahn did John as well as Matthew and Luke for his commentary. Heitmüller's contribution to *SNT* is popular and competent.

Wellhausen's *Das Evangelium Johannis* is disappointing when compared with his editions of the Synoptists. It is specially concerned not with the exegesis but with the analysis of the book into its sources. This is a matter for criticism rather than



for interpretation, with which we are specially concerned. This problem has attracted a great deal of attention of late in Great Britain as well as abroad, and of course the documentary analysis has a bearing on the exegesis. In this respect Loisy's career has been of interest. The first edition of his *Le Quatrième Évangile* (1903) was a volume of nine hundred and sixty pages, rather diffusely written and from an advanced standpoint, but a highly competent exposition. The unity of the Gospel was firmly asserted. In 1921 he published a much smaller work devoting about five hundred pages to the Gospel and nearly eighty to

the Johannine Epistles. In this revision of the exposition of the Fourth Gospel he has abandoned the unity, and suggests that an earlier draft of the work was expanded by a redactor. He thus applies here a solution with which readers of his works will be familiar elsewhere. The student would probably find more help from the first edition than from the second. I need only mention that an earlier volume by Calmes in the Roman Catholic series of French commentaries has been replaced by an important commentary from the hand of Lagrange.

(To be continued.)

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

#### The Half-way Folk.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,  
GLASGOW.

'Thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.'—Rev 3<sup>16</sup>.

In the book *When We Were Very Young*, which every boy and girl ought to know, there is this quaint little song:

Half-way down the stairs  
Is a stair  
Where I sit.  
There isn't any  
Other stair  
Quite like  
It.  
I'm not at the bottom,  
I'm not at the top;  
So this is the stair  
Where  
I always  
Stop.

Half-way up the stairs  
Isn't up,  
And isn't down.  
It isn't in the nursery,  
It isn't in the town.  
And all sorts of funny thoughts  
Run round my head:  
'It isn't really  
Anywhere!  
It's somewhere else  
Instead!'

There is a delightful picture of the little boy sitting at the turn of the stairs thinking 'all sorts of funny thoughts.'

Now that's all very well for a little boy on the nursery stairs, but it's not well at all for anybody climbing the ladder of life. But the little boy among his funny thoughts had hit on one thing that is very true; and that is that 'half-way up the stairs isn't really anywhere.'

This world is full of half-way people who think they are doing very well; but they aren't really anywhere. They are like the old woman who bowed her head at the name of the devil and who, when she was told it was at the name of Jesus she should bow, replied, 'I know that fine, but it's as well to have friends on both sides.' She wanted to be on good terms with the Saviour and she didn't want to be on bad terms with the devil, so she sat down half-way between and bowed to both.

In the Gospels Jesus talks about people who try to serve God and gold; about half-Christians who say and don't do. They are not very bad and they are not very good. They are betwixt and between. They are middling. They remind one of the Grand Old Duke of York:

When he was up, he was up,  
And when he was down, he was down,  
And when he was only half-way up,  
He was neither up nor down.

They don't want to be sinners, but they don't want to be saints. They are as near the bottom as the top. They are not anywhere. They are colourless. You can't say what they are, or on what side. You

can't tell whether they are going up or down. They have stopped at the turn.

But I can see this : they are facing downwards, for you can't very well sit on a stair facing upwards ; and those people who have sat down about the middle of the stairs of character have their backs turned to the heights, and what is behind our backs is very soon out of our minds. So there they are—stuck fast, hard aground, and quite content.

I see this too, that nobody ever got up to the top by sitting down. If you sit long enough, you fall asleep, and then you fall down and wake at the bottom with sore bones !

In the Old Testament Elijah asked the people of Israel, 'How long will ye halt between two opinions ? If the Lord be God, follow Him ; but if Baal, follow him.' They wanted to do both and stayed betwixt and between, and God was angry with them.

In the New Testament the Spirit of Jesus says to the Church of Laodicea, 'I know thy works, how thou art neither cold nor hot : I would thou wert cold or hot. So now because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.' That is to say, 'I wish you were something out and out, whatever it is.' Hot water is comforting, cold water is refreshing, but lukewarm water just makes folk sick. People like that, Jesus says, are 'not fit for the kingdom of God.' They are no use. There is no hole to fit them, for they have no shape.

Now the turn of the stairs is a tempting place to sit down. There are turns on the stairs of life that tempt us to sit down. One is when girls and boys are not children any more, and are not yet men and women. It is called 'adolescence'—a difficult word, but it just means the time between childhood and manhood or womanhood. As children they have learned to love God in a child's way, to love Jesus, to like to sing of Him and hear of Him and think of Him. Then just when they should go on some steps higher and stand up on His side, many sit down at the turn, and aren't anywhere, and never get anywhere.

Another turn is called 'middle age,' and there, too, many who have been faithful in work and worship just stop and sit down, and let all their high purposes of following Christ and their hopes of being like Him fade out.

Girls and boys, it won't do. It isn't really anywhere. You can't serve God and gold. People call it 'the golden mean' ; but it is very seldom golden, and it is very often mean. Our Saviour says, 'Whosoever is not with me, is against me.' God can save sinners, and can bless saints, but even God

is puzzled to make anything of the folk who are neither one thing nor another—the Half-way Folk. They are God's disappointments.

We dare not stop. We must go on and on, and up and up to the top : to full Christian manhood and full Christian womanhood, with Christ and for Christ's sake.

### A Challenge.

BY THE REVEREND F. C. HOGGARTH, MORECAMBE.

'Take thy part.'—2 Ti 2<sup>d</sup> (R.V.m.).

The Parks Committee of a certain City Council recently reported a big loss on the year's work. An illuminating analysis was given of the contents of the boxes at the gates. Entrants are given a programme in return for a contribution thrown into the boxes. Much besides money gets into those boxes. All is not coin that rattles. Hundreds of people in a great city are not above coming to hear the best bands that can be procured, and, as their contribution to the expenses, throwing in buttons, safety-pins, nails, boot protectors—anything, in fact, that will rattle.

They might pass the boxes by on the other side. But that would look mean. Besides, they want a programme, which is the hall-mark of their support. With a programme in the hand one is free from any suspicions of having come in without a contribution. So they pass muster, these members of the safety-pin and button brigade. Who pays, so long as they escape, is not their concern. They want the best bands, but any sense of honourable obligation never reaches to the box at the gate.

In the support of the Church we see how unequal the sacrifice is. Side by side with most beautiful loyalty there is found a most heedless lack of that virtue. Some, like Luther, feel themselves part of any situation they are in, others never seem to imagine they are part of any situation. That constitutes one of the greatest differences between people. Some do their part and some don't.

It is a great sort of ideal, this that Paul holds up for young Timothy when he says to him—'Take thy part.' None can begin too early to feel that he is part of any situation in which he finds himself, as a citizen, as a Christian. As such the right sort of person does not seek to be let off lightly. He is willing to take his part, to 'do his bit,' to 'stand his corner.' He recognizes that it is up to him to put at least as much into life as he takes out of it. He knows, too, that such loyalty will mean responsibility, the curbing of his freedom to do always the things he would, and at times real hardship.



During the War a young American officer told the writer that at first he refused the silver bar, the lieutenant's badge. He made excuse. He was not prepared for the responsibility. The straight challenging reply that he got was, 'If you refuse that bar, you're a quitter.' That was how men talked to one another in war-time. He took the bar. War or peace, however, should make little difference. Peace also has its challenges. The challenge of war might never be heard if all good men loyally accepted the challenge of peace. It is more easily possible to be a quitter in peace than in war.

'What are you doing for peace?' asked one ex-officer from a comrade he recently met. 'Nothing,' was the answer. 'Neither am I,' said the questioner. 'We both went through the war. We saw our pals die. But once the fighting is over we do nothing.' Neither of them felt quite comfortable about it. There they were, like thousands of others, doing nothing. Yet the unfulfilled task of Christianity is to organize the world on the basis of brotherhood. That is essentially the task for youth. In the present world-situation, the young should be ambitious to play their part—not seeking to be let off lightly, but eager to share the work that makes God's Kingdom come. Henry Drummond used to say that the first great epoch of the Christian life, after the awe and wonder of its dawn, was when there breaks into the mind the sense that Christ has a purpose for mankind, a purpose beyond us and our needs, which embraces every man and woman born, and their welfare in every part.

Mr. Basil Mathews, in his book *The Clash of Colour*, shows how the boys at Trinity College, Kandy, Ceylon, are learning to take their part.

Boys of all ages from nine to nineteen attend there, they are all shades of colour, from white to dark brown; boys of over a dozen different races. They have a fine sports record, but they are learning that school patriotism is not enough.

They have a Social Service League under which the boys, in co-operation with other people, have helped the poor to fight starvation in the food crises, and have joined in 'clean-up' days to fight the plague. Working with the municipal authorities, they have helped to clear out the filthy nooks and corners of the town, to get the people to destroy their plague-ridden rubbish, and to transfer them from the evacuated plague areas into barracks.

They have arranged for games in the poorer parts and started a play centre for boys; they have run unkempt, neglected boys into Scout Troops and made them keen footballers. They prepared a

survey of the need and possibilities of housing to do away with the slums of Kandy, and on their survey subsequent legislation was framed and houses have been built. Whilst still at school these boys are catching something of this take-your-part spirit.

If the Kingdom of God comes but slowly, is it not because of the number of those who shirk their part? Those who are not taking their share too often mar the whole enterprise. Clough's lines are still true:

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;  
It may be in yon smoke concealed  
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,  
And, but for you, possess the field.

## The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

### The Great Command.

'And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.'—Dt 6<sup>s</sup>.

We are all aware that Love to God and Love to Man are the primary principles of the Christian religion and ethic. According to the statement of Jesus, on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. The former, at least, is a primary principle of Old Testament, as well as of New Testament, religion. It is true that Jesus deepened love to God and broadened immeasurably love to man; but still in the forefront of pure religion, before Jesus as well as after Him, there stands this precept, 'thou shalt love the Lord thy God.'

So far, all is plain sailing; but as soon as we try to make that command concrete, we are faced with difficulties. We find that love to God cannot, any more than love to our friend, be fixed in a formula. It is all the harder to get at the essence of it, because it expresses itself so differently in different natures. St. James and men like him have one way of it. St. Paul and his spiritual brethren have another. Bernard of Clairvaux, Tauler, Eckhart, Madame de Guyon will have their language of mysticism. Horatius Bonar and Samuel Rutherford will have warm, rushing adjectives to describe it. Dr. Dale will say but little, until he has the opportunity of the language of deeds. Yet, all these will have loved their God, and will have been taken to rejoice in His love for ever. Therefore, it is unwise to go outside the scope of Scripture and to attempt more than to state the

origin of this love and some of its indispensable marks.

1. First of all, it has its source in the knowledge that we have of the love of God towards us. 'We love, because he first loved us.' 'Love is of God.' It is the revealed love of God towards us that awakens a like attitude in our hearts towards Him. We gain that revelation in three ways :

(1) In the daily acts of His Providence.  
(2) In the sending of Jesus ; and particularly in His death.

(3) In the actual human love of the Man, Christ Jesus. By these various means we are made aware of the permanent God-attitude towards us. When we are awake to it, an answering movement towards Him is expected of us. Thus we are not expected to do more than to have that feeling towards our Heavenly Father which is due to our experience of Him.

From another point of view in Scripture, love to God is based upon the relation which exists between the Perfect and the Imperfect. He is the Perfect. That is to say, He is Love. And His Love is made the basis of an obligation to love Him, on the ground that we ought to love the highest when we see it.

Finally, we learn that love to God is of such a sort that there comes from it, as its child, love to man. You remember how strongly St. John puts the point. 'He that saith he loveth God and loveth not his brother is'—not a half-developed Christian—not a man with an unfortunate disposition—not a man with any excuse whatever—but, 'he is a liar.'

2. When we come to the text itself, what chiefly strikes us is that love is inculcated as a duty. 'Thou *shalt* love the Lord thy God.'

Consequently, we need to take our idea into some region, to begin with, into which compulsion admittedly comes. Now, we admit that we can be commanded to 'love' the good, in the sense of selecting it, desiring it, and pursuing it. Thus, first, we say that Love of God is Love of Good. And we may claim Scriptural support for the view that our love of God is not to be sentiment or excitement of feeling, but is closely connected with wilful moral choice. 'This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.' In speaking of love to God, we have to remember the peculiar relation in which we stand to Him. The danger of analogies from human friendship is that we come to think of Him as altogether such another as we are. Whereas, we are related to God as we are to no other Being. He is Infinite ; we are finite. He is outside space and time ; all others that we

know are conditioned by them. Wherefore, our relation to Him is unique in our experience. So far, the love which we owe to Him is unique also. At the commencement it amounts to a choosing of His side in life ; an acknowledgment of the excellence of, and a surrender to, His will.

So, then, are we to understand the compulsion of the text. But God has so planned our natures that we do not rest there. There is a kind of sequence of experience, which is a spiritual law, which runs like this : strive continually to do good, and you will prefer to do good ; and in the process you will obtain a heart-convincing of God and will recognize Him, not only as Author of the moral law, but as the Heavenly Father. Whence there arises a new consciousness, which enables a man to say, '*my* Heavenly Father.' Then there is awakened in that man warmth of love to God. But that, as a fixed possession, is the reward rather than the commencement.

3. But, in all this, there is a hiatus. For love is not only an outcome of goodness, but an incentive. 'If ye love, ye *will* keep my commandments.' That is a statement of sequences, not a command. It indicates, 'Take care of the loving, and the commandment-keeping will take care of itself.' We all may have seen cases of the effect of friendship on ethical development. As Dr. Martineau says : 'There are cases of minds that out of the thought of self can do nothing ; but, press the lever of their affections, and, though it seems to have nothing whereon to rest, you will move their world.'

Now, that leads many of us into a cul-de-sac. 'Be pure, and ye shall know the love of God.' What is the use of that, if we first need the impulse of the Love in order to be pure ? Ah ! but there is an escape ! How ? Why, through Jesus Christ our Lord. The great Presence is always mediated to us by Christ. And, in the moments when faith is living, there comes a strong, inflexible certainty of a surrounding Christ-love, to which the hearts of us answer with a great rush of trust and security.<sup>1</sup>

#### SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

##### Intellect and Faith.

'When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me ; until I went into the sanctuary of God.'—Ps 73<sup>10</sup>. 17.

The poet is here concerned with a problem which only emerged at a relatively late period in the history of Israel. The difficulty of believing

<sup>1</sup> J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 193.



in God's righteous government of the world, in face of the apparent prosperity of the wicked man ; and the adversity of the good man, seems not to have pressed itself upon men's minds with any special cogency, until a severe crisis in the national life had made separation between class and class, and tested Jehovah's servants in the glowing furnace of affliction.

In the early and middle days of the Judæan monarchy, when the power of the nation was at its zenith, and men enjoyed, upon the whole, happy and prosperous times, it was the commonly received theory that in this life Jehovah rewarded the righteous and punished the wicked ; prosperity was regarded as an immediate mark of His favour ; adversity—especially if sudden and overwhelming—as a sure sign of His displeasure. But the period of decadence which preceded the fall of the kingdom of Judah was marked by grave social abuses and growing indifference to the spirit of Jehovah's religion, coupled with bare formalism or the definite introduction of foreign cults. Upright and pious men formed a despised, if not a persecuted, minority ; justice and virtue seemed to bring, not success, but loss and failure in their train. And during the Babylonian Exile this condition of things appears rather to have been accentuated than diminished. Nor was the return from Babylon by any means a restoration of happy and prosperous times for this faithful remnant. Though those who availed themselves of the decree of Cyrus belonged, in the main, to the body who held by the hope of Israel, and were, as a whole, animated by a common aim, yet the hardships to be contended with were enormous.

It was in times such as these that men turned to review their ancient position, and to perceive its partiality and insufficiency. Righteousness certainly no longer appeared uniformly to bring its reward, nor wickedness its due punishment. We must recollect that at that stage of thought quick returns were looked for. The view that righteousness would be rewarded after death, and that present hardship might form a training for a future state, so far from being generally held, was, in fact, the outcome of thought which appeared *later on* as part of the answer to the difficulties which the anomalies of the present life excited in men's minds.

But as for me, my feet were almost gone ;  
My steps had well-nigh slipped.  
For I was envious at the arrogant,  
When I saw the prosperity of the wicked.

But even in his misery it comes upon him that this is not the attitude which a member of the true Israel ought to adopt.

If I had said, I will speak thus ;  
Behold, I had dealt treacherously with the generation of thy children.

Therefore, when faith seems weakest, he determines to make the severest trial of faith. He takes his difficulty into the sanctuary of God. And it is here that a solution offers itself to his mind, and he meets with perfect satisfaction.

When I thought how I might know this,  
It was too painful for me ;  
Until I went into the sanctuary of God,  
And considered their latter end.

Let us glance for a moment at the Psalmist's explanation. It is briefly this. The prosperity of the ungodly is, after all, more apparent than real. There is a Nemesis who is waiting in their path. Even while they stretch out their eager hands to gather life's flowers, the solid rock gives way beneath their feet, and they go down quick into the abyss.

Now it must be observed that this solution is not in any sense final and altogether satisfactory. It represents a small advance in thought upon the old opinion ; but is, in fact, merely a partial and fragmentary contribution to the truth, and was destined soon to be merged in a larger view of God's dealings with men.

But this is not the Psalmist's real gain during his visit to the sanctuary. We find it rather in that conviction which seizes him of the great reality of his communion with God—a conviction which calls forth from him such a confession of trust in God as forms, when we consider his partial light and uncertain knowledge of the future life, a passage as remarkable and splendid as anything in the pages of the Old Testament.

Nevertheless I am continually with thee :  
Thou hast holden my right hand.  
Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel,  
And afterward receive me to glory.  
Whom have I in heaven but thee ?  
And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee.

My flesh and my heart faileth :  
But God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever.

It has been much questioned whether the Psalmist is here formulating any definite statement of belief in a life of blessedness beyond the grave. This does not seem to be precisely the position which he takes. Rather, in the fullness of the sense of his communion with Jehovah, he ignores or overlooks the fact of death; feeling that he possesses all he needs, and that, in any event, he is entirely in the hands, and under the special care, of his God.

He might have argued that the question was dangerous, as striking at the foundations of belief, and so have determined to preserve his faith by ignoring it. Or, on the other hand, he might have reasoned that, until such a difficulty had been set at rest, belief reposed upon too precarious a basis, and that it was better therefore to suspend his judgment, together with the worship of a God whose dealings with mankind were so mysterious and obscure. He did neither. Rather, while maintaining and exercising his right to rational investigation of the question which harassed his mind, in the light of the facts which lay to his hand, he trusted that beyond this there was something *supernatural* which God alone was able to grant in response to an act of faith; and that this latter, so far from being antagonistic to the results obtained by the exercise of reason, was indeed intended to condition and to set them in a right direction. And so he betook himself to the place where God's mysterious Presence was believed specially to be manifest, and staking all upon an act of faith, he obtained, not merely a rational solution of his difficulty, but, what was of far higher value, such an inward sense of Jehovah's fatherly care and protection as secured him for ever in his faith and endued him with perfect peace.

And this is surely the way in which we ought to meet the doubts and difficulties which so frequently assail us. We are not likely to place them on one side and to ignore them, but we must feel bound to subject them to the searching light which the advancement of knowledge has placed within our reach. Rightly so. But let us not forget that we are members of a Church which believes in and proclaims the supernatural Presence of her Lord in her midst, and that He has promised to give Himself to those who seek Him, in order that He may guide them into all truth. And let us be willing at least to make trial of the act of faith, coming to Him that we may cast our burdens upon Him, and receive for ourselves out of His fullness.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> C. F. Burney, *The Gospel in the Old Testament*, 207.

## WHITSUNDAY.

### The Gift of the Holy Spirit.

'And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.'—Ac 2<sup>4</sup>.

1. *The Festival.*—It is something more than history which tells us that Good Friday does not fall in Easter week; it is spiritual necessity which places Good Friday and Easter in a certain order, for, as the Apostle says, 'if we be dead with Christ, we shall also live with him'; or, as the Salvation Army lassie said when she was telling her experience, 'I had to learn that Good Friday came before Easter Day.' The case is not so simple nor the fact so readily observed in the case of another pair of festivals to which we must now draw attention—the Ascension of Christ and the Descent of the Holy Ghost. One does not instinctively connect Ascensiontide and Whitsuntide together. There is a great difference in kind between the two. The former is a festival of heaven, the latter belongs entirely to the experience of the Church on earth. The Ascension was a festival of heaven; it was there that the bells were ringing, not in the most heavenward-reaching of our towers; it was there that they unloosed the bars of massy light and let the King of Glory in; it was the angelic company that had the rapture, who had followed Him all His life through:

Oft wondering where and how at last  
The mystic scene would end.

They brought His chariot from above  
To bear Him to His throne,  
Spread their triumphant wings and cried,  
'The glorious work is done!'

In a word, they crowned Him Lord of all; but of the fact of the coronation, in any sense that should provoke a festival record, there does not seem to have been a suspicion in the minds of the primitive believers. And it was not until ten days afterward that the news of heaven became the property of earth, and the saints below began to sing in concert with those that were above and to say that 'God has made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ,' 'He is by the right hand of God exalted; he has received of the Father the promise of the Spirit,' which we now experience. They had linked together the two festivals and made the conjunction of heavenly and terrestrial bliss. It is, therefore, quite clear that these two festivals are a co-ordinated sequence. The Pentecost becomes intelligible when it is seen to be a festival of the exalted and glorified Christ.



2. *The Experience*.—So much having been said with regard to the calendar and its external apparatus for the illustration of spiritual things, let us try to get at the spiritual things themselves. The experience of Pentecost is not marked by any other chronology than that of obedience and faith; and these will make a Pentecost anywhere and at any time. Perhaps we shall see this more clearly if we turn to the account of the great and notable day in the Acts of the Apostles; when we do so we find that the stress is laid on time, place, and concord: a day fully come, a place conformed to the habit of an expectant people, and a united spirit of faith. Now, suppose we ask the question, Which of these is the most important, in which quarter did the magic lie, from whence did the grace proceed? From the time? Not necessarily, for the phenomenon repeated itself many times. From the place? No, for it occurred outside Jerusalem, however much it began in and from Jerusalem. From the concord? Certainly this is the mark of every such outpouring and visitation; it is the result of an understanding between God and man and between one man and his brethren. Thus we arrive at the underlying truth that *the day of Pentecost was not a day, but an agreement*.

3. *Its Features*.—And now let us see some of the features which made this visitation of God so great and notable; let us come to the experience itself.

We will speak of it in two of its results: first, as being an equipment in personality; second, as being the reception of the apostolic and Christian credentials.

Now, with regard to personality, may we not say that the Holy Spirit is the missing factor in our personality, and that without it we cannot be altogether ourselves, as God wants us to be? For we notice that an abiding gift means an abiding change in the person to whom the gift is made; and this is an abiding gift: it is said that 'He shall abide with you for ever.' So, then, if the Holy Spirit is a Divine Abiding, the result of the gift will be found in personal equipment and change. To keep the matter simple, and to keep it also forcible, we will call for a testimony as to what the work of the Holy Spirit in the transformation of personality is like. Here is one, of a very simple character.

'Now was I come up in Spirit, through the flaming sword, into the paradise of God. All things were new, and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter. I knew nothing but pureness, innocence, and righteousness; so that I was come up to the state of Adam, which he was in before he fell.'

Now let us think of the way in which this visita-

tion of the Holy Ghost furnishes the credentials for Divine service. St. Ephraem the Syrian tells us that the children of Israel believed Moses when he came down from the mountain because the rays of light from his face furnished a testimony to the truth of his word! It was necessary that Moses should have credentials, for 'whereby shall it be known that thou hast sent me?' the man might ask. So Moses came down from the mountain, supported, not by the conventional two or three witnesses who shall confirm his word, but by two or three thousand convincing and converting sunbeams, declaring without fear of contradiction that 'this man is come to you with a message from your Lord.' The right preaching is that in which something about the man commends the message. And we may say, therefore, that it is of the nature of a true Pentecostal experience to produce a *congruity between the message and the messenger*. Now certainly this was the case with our Lord Himself. The people who heard Him were blessed before ever He opened His mouth and said, 'Blessed are ye.' They were rested before ever He said, 'I will give you rest.' The gospel was Christ even more than it was the word of Christ; and there was a perfect congruity between the Christ-Person and the Christ-word. And this being His experience, we may be sure that something like it appears in the experiences of the apostolic men and women, the earlier and later saints, and believers generally. They have a gospel which has to be proclaimed, but it has also to be commended; it has to be announced, but it has also to be adorned. The Pentecostal congruity between the Messenger and the Message arises from this inward experience, this reign of God in the heart and conscience. And the Holy Ghost will fall on those who hear the word, when it has first fallen upon those who speak the word. It will make them able where they have before been weak; it saves them from impotence, reluctance, and disability. Negatively also it removes from the life those wayward desires which choke the word, impede the life, and postpone the kingdom. Thus the visitation of the Holy Ghost is only another way of describing the effect which Christ has upon willing and surrendered souls: the visitation is, in fact, the vision. It instructs us to follow after Him, and to become fishers of men. It does in continuance what a single visit or interview used to do in the days of His flesh. It is not a different kind of grace from that which came to the woman of Samaria, when a single talk with One who told her all that ever she did made her an evangelist and (may we not say?) an apostle.

And to her also He spoke of an inward fountain

which should spring up into an eternal life ; and it would be difficult to describe Pentecost and its experience in more exact terms.

Pentecost adds nothing to the equipment of doctrines : it adds everything to the equipment of the teachers. The equipment of doctrine stands where it did. It is expressed in words like these out of the past of the learners : ' Lord, I believe,' ' Thou art the Christ,' ' He is really risen,' ' Thou knowest all things,' and the like. What, then, is the real increment ? A little more faith in the Lord, and a great deal more of resulting experience ; a sense of personal union with Him and of personal interest in His grace and His promises ; a conviction that the promise is to us which will enable us presently to say to some one else that ' the promise is to you ' ; a conviction for holiness which will result presently in a confession of holiness, as the Spirit of Truth shall lead.

The right way to understand the difference which the great Visitation made is to imagine what would have happened if they had gone on without it, if they had not tarried in Jerusalem for the Divine equipment. They could have gone on without it ; they already were a Church ; their names were written both in earth and heaven ; they had a message to the world. So they might have made some progress. And perhaps it might not have been altogether unlike the experience of some modern Churches, where they do not preach upon the text, ' The little one shall become a thousand,' but where they discuss whether they are keeping up with the population and its normal growth. In that case Peter might have said to the first believers, ' We are now a hundred and twenty in number, and Christ is risen ; perhaps by the end of the year we shall be a hundred and twenty-one.' But what saith the Scripture ?—' The same day there were added to the church three thousand souls.' That was the difference. The little one became a thousand under their eyes, and they could see the mustard-seed grow and become a tree as they watched it.<sup>1</sup>

#### TRINITY SUNDAY.

##### The Glories of Christ.

' Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father ; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever.'—Rev 1<sup>6</sup>. 6.

He ' loves us, and loosed us from our sins in his blood, and made us kings and priests unto God,'

<sup>1</sup> J. Rendel Harris, *Aaron's Breastplate*, 159.

that, in John's view, is the ever-wonderful thing in Jesus Christ, which most clearly marks Him out as worthy to have glory and dominion at all times. Later in his book (5<sup>9</sup>. 10), when he imagines what the blessed sing of, he imputes to them no other cause of gladness. Their lives on earth are now completed ; they have passed beyond our confusions and see things as they are, but even there they find no grander theme than the redemption wrought by Christ. That other life is the completion and consummation of the present : and as we see men up to the extreme limit of sense still growing in love and wonder for their Lord, we may be sure that they will not forget in that large world which lies before us.

Let us speak, then, of two engrossing wonders—of *what Christ does for men* in loving them, and of *what He makes of men*, in setting them as kings and priests to God.

1. *What Christ does for men.*—John reckoned first that our Master is glorious and worthy of all power, because He loves us and because He died for us. The present tense of the verb, which the Revised Version has restored, has a reality and intimacy which the other reading lacks. That love of His is not of yesterday, but is timeless. It is marked by incidents which have given both life and death another look, and specially by the supreme incident of the Cross ; but there is no beginning to the love of Christ, and there can be no ending. We dare not say of any man that there was a time when Jesus Christ did not think of him. Each new arrival on our planet, before ever his eyes have seen the light, has this of wonder hanging round him like a golden haze. Here is a creature coming from God's hand out into a world pervaded by Divine activities. The love of God, as revealed in Jesus Christ, will beset him behind and before, following him over many ways ; and one day God will lay His hand upon His child, and awaken him to the sense of the greatest fact of all. ' He loves us '—that is the burden of the song of those whose eyes are opened.

To John this marked the farthest reach of glory in his Master. Throughout the years since first he met with Jesus he had been gathering courage to write that ' God is love,' and nothing made him so conscious of the difference between his Master and the best of men as the Divine largeness of His heart. In our narrowness we draw lines amongst our acquaintances, marking off so many whom we cannot bring ourselves to like. We see nothing in them to admire or to attract ; it may be that we even find much to repel. But our



Lord is more magnanimous ; and just as a true poet catches hints of the most gorgeous imaginings in places which we find drab and dull, so Christ's thoughts of men are not as our thoughts, nor His ways as our ways.

Sometimes we must be astonished, not so much that Jesus Christ should love men whom we dislike or despise, as that He should love us : looking into our hearts we are impressed by our native ugliness of mood, and we wonder that He is not also repelled. Our lowness of aim, our lack of grace and courtesy, of kindness, and consistency, and chivalry—these make us often odious to ourselves. Anxiously we conceal such faults from our neighbours lest they should condemn us utterly ; and yet the Lord from whom nothing is hidden speaks no sentence of exclusion. There are acts and moods which an honest man can scarcely pardon in himself, and yet 'when we were without strength Christ died for the ungodly.' He begins to understand what Ezekiel wrote : 'That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame ; when I have forgiven thee all that thou hast done.' It was there that many of us, for the first time, saw the full wonder of Christ's greatness, and were ready, with John, to exclaim, Here truly is something high and lordly ! Here is One worthy to have the crown ! 'To him who loves us be the glory and the rule for ever !'

2. *What Christ makes of men.*—'He loosed us from our sins . . . he made us kings and priests to God.' It is one mark of a born governor of men that he not only can give to noble tools their proper play, but can turn the poorest tools to extraordinary uses. Cromwell spoke with scorn of the kind of recruits who were pressed at first into the Parliamentary army : 'Your troops,' he said to John Hampden, 'are most of them old, decayed serving-men and tapsters and such kind of fellows ; do you think that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen that have honour and courage and resolution in them ? You must get men of a spirit that is likely to go as far as gentlemen will go, or else you will be beaten still.' And later he reports that he 'raised such men as had the fear of God before them, and made some conscience of what they did ; and from that day forward I must say to you they were never beaten.' That is the record of a famous captain who had the gift of discovering and attaching to himself men who were fit for his work ; but how much higher a place would the great Protector deserve if he had been able out of the poor stuff of

the old army to fashion such a force as he required, to inspire the battered hearts of its men with his own heroic temper ! And that is Christ's continual achievement. His victories are won by men who were not always on His side, and who at first gave little promise of quality. Paul, in one place, runs over a hideous catalogue of offences, and adds, 'And such were some of you ; but ye were washed, ye were justified, ye were sanctified'—consecrated to the service of God, and started on the way to sainthood. That is Christ's inimitable work, to lay hold of unsteadfast men for His great occasions and then to make them conquerors. But even that is too weak an expression to describe all that He achieves in those who admit His influence : for Paul has to manufacture a word, and he says that Christ makes us 'conquerors and more.'

'He loosed us from our sins in his blood'—so in life there may be new beginnings, which for those growing old in evil must seem the best of all possible tidings. Christian people so lamentably fail in their thoughts of the new life that they need to be admonished by the confidence of Jesus. To Him His work appeared not as a passing affair, the asserting of a principle, or an exhibition of heroic feeling ; He believed and proclaimed that something was actually accomplished by Himself. He who was 'meek and lowly of heart' declared without reserve that 'if he were lifted out from the earth he would draw all men unto him.' On the night of His betrayal He gave them wine, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood'—what Jeremiah had spoken of six centuries before, and what had remained so long an unfulfilled ideal ; but now, said Jesus, it is secured by My death. There is a new relation with God, in which distrust and disobedience have no longer any place, and it is I who have achieved it. In the final hour of darkness, when strength might have been at its lowest, He cried, 'It is finished !' ; the work for which the world has been waiting is completed. It would be well for us if we could learn from Christ to think thus decisively of the difference which He has made. When the Pilgrim came to the Cross the burden on his back fell off : 'Then was Christian glad and lightsome, and with a merry heart he said, He hath given me rest by His sorrow, and life by His death. Then he stood still a while to look and wonder, for it was very surprising to him that the sight of the Cross should thus ease him of his burden.'

But Jesus not only separates men from their past of failure, He sets them forward on a new and

glorious course, making them kings and priests to God. Of the two titles kingship has the sound of higher dignity, but priesthood is the more substantial privilege. What everywhere tends to keep men low is their remoteness from God. That binds the cares and miseries of life upon them, for griefs, in other conditions bearable, now fret the soul, whilst graver troubles crush or harden. Men may admit that the anxieties which harass them are disproportioned, but they cannot rise above these, until Christ ends the difficulty by bringing them near to God. He shows them what God is like, and thus inclines them to claim kinship with Him. He takes them by the hand, His utter confidence making them bold, and brings them to the Presence, and He makes them feel that it is part of their duty to be near. 'My remembrance of thee is unceasing,' he says, 'in my prayers night and day.' And thus, with good right, he admonishes his friends to be 'anxious about nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known to God; and the peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your heart and mind in Jesus Christ.' That is the priestly rule, where accident and whim are excluded, and 'in everything' approach is made to God; and the end of that rule is peace. It is

to this we also are called, for 'he has made us priests to God.'

The kingship follows on the priesthood thus conceived. An old poet had daringly said that God has 'put all things under the feet of man'; but this dominion, if it ever was exercised, has been lost, and we find ourselves enslaved where we were meant to bear rule. But the wrong is set right by Christ, who brings His brethren back to their appointed dignity, making them lords of His own creation. Paul merely translates the promise of kingship into other words when he says that 'all things work together for good to them that love God,' for what before was threatening and hostile is turned about by God to be of service in the growing life. A man to whom every experience thus brings tribute is a true king in the world; he is enthroned where nothing can assail him, for even death itself is his. When love has banished fear, and he knows God as his friend, then all things are on his side. So Christ brings men back to fellowship with God and dominion over circumstance. No wonder that John was moved to exclaim, 'To Him who can raise a sinful man to such a height of nature, to Him the glory must be due and the dominion for ever and ever.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Macgregor, *Repentance unto Life*, 176.

## The Newer Estimate of Judaism.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., CAMBUSLANG.

At a time when Judaism shows some sign of revising its attitude to Christianity, it is noteworthy that Christian scholars are revising their estimate of Judaism. One of the latest contributions to this process, and probably the most important, is that of Professor G. F. Moore. His two magnificent volumes<sup>1</sup> are the ripe fruit of a mind deeply and widely versed in Rabbinic literature, and have at once been hailed as authoritative and, indeed, as making such books as Schürer's and Bousset's out of date. They are written with utter detachment and impartiality; indeed, with a curious phlegm. For, though the period they cover includes the break-away or emergence of Christianity,

the destruction of Jerusalem, and the revolt of Bar Cochba, the volumes can be read from cover to cover without one quickening of the pulse. The explanation is the unreserved adoption of the point of view and horizon of Orthodox Judaism for the purpose of the book, resulting in a surrender, of which the author may be hardly conscious, to its spirit and method. A trifling example is found in the appendix, where the dates of the various Rabbis quoted are given, not, as the eager reader might expect to find them for his modern mind, according to the Christian era—it is of great interest to know the date when the point may be the comparison of Rabbinic and Gospel teaching—but by such a mysterious symbol as P. A. 3, which means Palestinian Amora, third generation. An appendix enables one with cruder thirst for in-

<sup>1</sup> *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 42s.).



formation to ascertain that this was about A.D. 270-300. It also warns the reader that where index and text do not agree, the index is to be preferred as containing the author's latest judgment.

Orthodox Judaism, according to this authority, really has little history except a quiet academic history which traces not so much the development as the gradual explication of its content. The test of the relevance of events or ideas is whether or not they are mentioned and incorporated in the Talmudic tradition. Judged thus, the birth of Christianity caused no sensation. The sack of Jerusalem is mainly noteworthy in forcing the schools to find new quarters, and Professor Moore seems to establish his case that it really was an academic succession, profoundly learned and diligent, yet hard-shelled to all influences it felt to be external, which founded, preserved, expounded, and handed on the traditional orthodox Judaism which kept the Jewish race distinct, and has dominated its life ever since. It is not unfair to claim that what is to be called Judaism should be determined by the history of Judaism as a whole and in the long run. By this criterion Judaism culminated and defined itself, and has now presented itself to the world for nearly 2000 years in the form which was the result of the labours of the Rabbis called the Tannaim. On all this scholarly toil events made small impact, and to it environment contributed nothing, for it was founded on a revelation essentially complete and explicable from the text of Scripture. Professor Moore protests against the Christian era being taken as if in some way it marked an epoch in Judaism. Much more of a worry to orthodoxy was the claim of the Samaritans, based on some strong Scripture evidence, that Shechem was the true site for the central worship. Greece and Rome, Jesus and Titus, this self-centred academic tradition ignored, yet it constituted the historic Judaism which survived and sustained the scattered people and endures still.

As regards Christianity, from the orthodox point of view it was for long a conventicle within the synagogue, composed of pious Jews,<sup>1</sup> who, since Judaism had no accepted dogma regarding Messiah, were free to maintain if they liked that in Jesus He had appeared, and that He would return to judge the world and inaugurate a golden age. Only when Christians as such refused to join in the Bar Cochba revolt in A.D. 134—for they could not

profess to believe in his Messianic claim—did the definite cleavage come between Jewish Christianity and the synagogue.

What, then, was this orthodox Judaism? Fundamental for it was its idea of revelation, namely, that God had of His good pleasure definitely made known His will for men in Scriptures that were thus authoritative and final. We may demur to Professor Moore's dictum that such is the only possible conception of a revealed religion, but it is important to grasp the fact that at least it was the conception of Judaism. Every part of this revelation being Divine and perfect, it required neither supplement nor development, and any seeming new truth was really implied and by adequate exegesis could be discovered in any place in the texts. The Rabbinic exegesis, which often appears mere twiddling, is based on this theory or philosophy; and because there is such a thing as unchanging truth, it does at times with real religious genius succeed. The height to which it soared is seen in Jesus' proof of immortality from the text, 'I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob.'

This theory, as a whole, is strangely remote from the modern mind which finds a scheme of religious progress and education in the Old Testament. No glimmering of such notions appeared to a Rabbi. His own theory remained tenable to him, partly because the divergencies of views abundantly found in the Old Testament concerned mainly matters of thought and speculation on which dogmatism was not demanded; partly because it was amazing how largely ingenuity could explain away contradictions and discover identities when exegesis was unhampered by rational criticism. And it is to be noted that the theological consequences of this view of Scripture are in Judaism mainly identical with the Puritan or Presbyterian conceptions enshrined in the Westminster Confession. 'Sin is any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God.' Only Judaism made no distinction of moral and criminal law. Yet, if revealed religion is necessarily legal, the consequence is that the only remedy for man's case is forgiveness, and this forgiveness is provided for by Divine grace. For that other Shorter Catechism definition of repentance is, with the omission of the reference to Christ, exactly the Rabbinical doctrine. 'Repentance is a saving grace, whereby a sinner out of a true sense of his sin doth with grief and hatred of his sin turn from it unto God with full purpose of, and endeavour after, new obedience.' This grace, according to

<sup>1</sup> 'The first fifteen bishops of Jerusalem were all circumcised Jews.'—GIBBON.

Jewish exegesis, was provided even before creation, for in Ps 90 we read: 'From everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. Thou turnest man to contrition' (thus instead of 'destruction,' A.V.); 'and sayest, Repent, ye children of men.' Grace is not an afterthought; the world was made on a religious pattern, or indeed with a view to religion. 'Man's chief end is to glorify God.' And in the Gospels no new definition of repentance is given, its meaning is assumed to be familiar. What is new is simply the urgency of the call in view of the Messiah's coming.

To the question when Judaism first adopted this theory and became essentially a faith preserved by theological academic tradition and imposed thus in its practical application on an obedient people, the answer has often been, that this was the result of the Exile. The people of a land or sanctuary then became the people of a book. Wellhausen is more cautious than some others in believing that a long time passed before the kernel turned wooden in the shell, and that indeed until Phariseism prevailed, the freer impulses emanating from the prophets remained active. But against the whole theory that a process of petrification set in has to be set the fact that after the Exile and Ezra came such writings as Job and Psalm 139. What really happened was rather a direct and logical development of prophetic teaching in the light of practical conditions. The starting-point is Jeremiah's individualizing of religion carried through with relentless logic by Ezekiel. This involved the spiritualizing of the whole idea of repentance, and indeed the coining of a vocabulary to express this, together with the cultivation of a scrupulous conscience regarding personal obedience. Religion became altogether a personal relation between man and God; though this personal relation was to be attained in fellowship with others and membership of the nation. This is the real development, and it is complete already in the Psalms. In fact, apart from the question of immortality, orthodox Judaism shows little change after 200 B.C., which was several generations before the dominance of Phariseism.

This spiritualizing of repentance and insistence on personal responsibility fitted in with the character of the synagogue. That new institution, with its discipline of prayer and study, replaced the temple cultus so largely for practical purposes in the living consciousness of Judaism, that the question which suggests itself at the destruction of Jerusalem is not, 'How did Judaism survive the shock?' but 'Did Judaism feel any shock?' Indeed, the first real shock that Judaism has had

to meet is that which is to-day shaking its very foundations, namely, the application of the idea of evolution to revelation. Christianity, with its doctrine of the spirit, is tolerant of this modern philosophy, or rather is in accord with it. But the idea drives a wedge between Orthodox Judaism and all the modern liberal Jewish movements, which really tend more and more towards a unitarian Christianity.

For the Christian theologian, two questions arise from this presentation of Judaism. One is, whether the Christian movement was conscious of any vital difference between its own attitude and that of the schools to the study of the traditional revelation. To this the answer must be a simple negative. Christ's answer to the Sadducees about marriage in the age to come, and His proof of immortality, His extension of the meaning of neighbour in the parable of the Good Samaritan, like Paul's appeal to the story of Hagar, were on the current line of interpretation. Paul's criticism of Judaism was not that it had been mistaken, but that it was superseded. The retort of Jews to Christian exegesis was not to attack any changed method of interpretation, but to issue a revised version of the *LXX*, Aquila's translation, which cut away certain textual bases for their argument.

The other question is, how far to accept the demonstration in these pages that the familiar contrast between law and grace, as the distinguishing marks of Judaism and Christianity, is false or at least exaggerated. It might have to be conceded that Professor Moore not only can take a longer, wider survey of Judaism, but may know it as thoroughly as, or more thoroughly than, Paul; for printed books and critical editions are a tremendous aid to study. On the other hand, Paul was not only a genius but a competent Rabbinical scholar by the standard of his day, and he lived within the system, and his evidence is to the effect that he felt the contrast to be vital.

According to Professor Moore, as against Paul, righteousness in Judaism is not a perfection which it recognized as obviously impossible, and was of course recognized by God as impossible when He made this world, but is obedience to law (including what is available of the sacrificial system Divinely provided) coupled with repentance. The question is begged when Jewish piety is called 'legalism,' it might rather be called 'loyalty.' For, while meticulous definition is given of matters that can be defined, such as tithes and ceremonies, other matters are expressly referred to vaguely, as committed to the heart, and the pious man is loyal to



the core in both divisions of the field, making no presumptuous assumptions, that anything can be dismissed as a mere 'external.' A lot in the world to come, even if assured of a Jew by race, is assured by the election of his race through free grace; and, even when a reward of good works is hoped for, it is a graciously promised reward, not a payment earned.

Yet the Pauline antithesis of law and grace is echoed in the Fourth Gospel—'the law came by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ'; and, if the Pauline Luke's report is not regarded as coloured by later reflexion, it is found in Peter's utterance—'the law that neither we nor our fathers were able to bear.' Far more important, and indeed overweighing 'all that can be adduced to show Jesus as holding steadfastly to the Law, is the great saying reported of Him: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and learn of me, for my yoke is easy, and my burden light.' It is difficult to deny a reference here to the scribes and Pharisees, who bound heavy burdens on the shoulders of the people, to which they themselves, hypocrites, would not put a finger. Even if the saying has not this special controversial edge, it does imply a contrast between Jesus' yoke and every other rule of life; and that nearest to hand was certainly the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law. Here, at least, the criticism of the Pharisees suggested is not merely the hypocrisy of the teachers but the burdensomeness of the system.

All this, however, hardly gets beyond the circle of literary criticism. Christianity is certainly not defined by a compendium of its tenets or maxims; and, if orthodox Judaism can thus be exhibited, Judaism was also manifested in cruder popular forms which were less gracious; and there must have been a larger Judaism which was in mutually felt hostility to Christianity and was not in complacent isolation from all influences of environment and events. Professor Moore passes over the hostility felt to proselytes. At various points in his book one is on the brink of discovering such a wider interest, when one is told shortly to draw back one's eyes from matters which lay outside orthodox Judaism. Can we dismiss apocalyptic, which emerged in such voluminous form, as no more important than for Christianity are the views of modern millenarians? Can we believe that the admittedly enormously successful mission to the Greek world through the Dispersion produced as little repercussion in Jewish thought as the Talmud suggests? And, above all, is it possible that the radical nature of the break-away which left Judaism

high and dry was undetected and unresented in its earlier stages and indeed for nearly 100 years?

On more than one point it is probable that the conclusion pressed home with such mastery of material must be unreservedly accepted, and some of the easy and familiar contrasts often drawn between Christianity and Judaism will have to go by the board. The idea of the Fatherhood of God was common in Jewish thought, and in Rabbinic teaching was brought out of the background in which it lay in prophecy and made prominent. The fact that apocalyptic imagery makes God remotely transcendent is simply a necessity of its pictorial method, not a contribution to theology. Besides the idea of Fatherhood, a precious element in Judaism is the prophetic idea of the personality of God, that is integral and dominating in the conception of God's unity. Judaism arrived at monotheism not by reflecting on the need for one creator of the physical world or of a unifying metaphysical principle, but by the moral implications of faith in God's will and purpose and character.

On the question of the Jewish attitude to its mission to the nations, Professor Moore would abandon the use of abstract terms like 'nationalism' and 'universalism,' as suggesting considerations outside the range of Jewish thought. For prophecy and Judaism the Law was always ideally conceived as universal in its scope, and the Kingdom of God, the universal acceptance of the law, meant the unlimited extension of Jewish nationality. Always the Jewish mission aimed at incorporating converts—proselytes—into the Jewish race; thus its idea was at once universal and national. This was the natural outlook when the final hope took the form of an earthly Paradise. And Judaism never revised it to meet the demand we feel to be made on thought by the more spiritual eschatology of the belief in immortality and a new age.

If some of the dividing lines one had thought to see between Christianity and Judaism are thus blotted or blurred, the result is to confirm the notion that it was not in the earthly ministry of Jesus or immediately thereafter that Christianity attained clear consciousness of its own new principles. And if it is demonstrated that the differentia are not what some have taught—even in the N.T.—the fact remains that there was a difference, and we are left to find it at other points, in faith in Christ, and the guidance of the Spirit. Jesus crucified must be related, as Stephen and Paul saw, not merely to Judaism, but to God and the world, and communion with God through Christ displaces

the letter of the Law. Even if we surrender Paul's antithesis of law and grace, he was right through and through in insisting that in Christianity was universalism in an absolute sense and that the law both moral and ceremonial was set aside in favour

of the law of liberty, the mind of Christ. Universal Jewish nationality was a narrow and illusory hope. The Kingdom of God abolishes frontiers, and makes Christ the centre, not of triumphant Judaism, but of humanity.

## Three in One, One in Three: A Study.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM ROSS, B.D., EDINBURGH.

CREEDS, Confessions, Catechisms, Compendiums of theology are all human and therefore fallible. At the best they are crystallizations of the thought of their own time, not of all time. Of these compendiums of theology known to us; however, for brevity and yet comprehensiveness, for logical sequence of thought and literary grace of expression, few stand higher than the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Divines. In that Catechism, the following definition is given: 'There are three Persons in the Godhead; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory.'

To my mind, remembering the crucible of criticism through which this definition has passed in recent years, with the single exception of the word 'Person,' for which I would substitute the word 'Personality,' there is no definition of the Trinity that can be substituted for it. Definition, however, is one thing, intelligibility is another. The question we now face is this: Is this definition rational, intelligible, credible, or is it, as some say, a contradiction in terms? I take an orange or an apple, and divide it in three parts, and I say that each of these parts is contained in the other two, or that the whole is contained in each of the parts, and I speak nonsense. My words are a contradiction in terms. When I say that Godhead consists of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Personalities in One, One in Three, am I speaking nonsense, am I perpetrating the same contradiction in terms?

Now in the first place, definitely and dogmatically, every material analogy to the Trinity is futile and fallacious, and necessarily so. It cannot be otherwise, because God is spirit only, and the categories of spirit and matter are different, different in being and in thought, and the laws of these two are not only different, but in some respects opposite. One illustration. It is a story about Thomas Carlyle. The origin of the story I do not know, and I cannot

vouch for the truth of it, but it comes from so many quarters that it must be true about him or some other. It is so inept as to be ridiculous, but it serves my purpose, and can be quoted without irreverence. Carlyle one day conversed with a minister, and the subject of conversation was the Trinity. Carlyle had difficulty about it, and the two men parted with mutual dissatisfaction. Next day they met on the highway, and at that moment a gig with three people in it passed them. Now ministers may be stupid like other people, but this one must have been more stupid than the average, for he said, 'There is the very thing we spoke of yesterday which you said was impossible—three in one, three men in one gig.' The answer was obvious, and it came in a flash, 'Yes, but when did you see one person in three gigs?' Dogmatically and emphatically, every material illustration of the Trinity must be futile and fallacious.

Now I desire to say, audacious as it may seem, that for many years the Trinity has not presented to me an intellectual difficulty; that, if rightly viewed, it is not a contradiction in terms, but on the contrary the doctrine is rational, intelligible, credible, satisfying to mind and heart. There are three avenues along which this doctrine may be approached, two of them avenues of reason, argument, illustration, and the third the avenue of revelation and the experience by which it is proved to be true.

I. The first avenue is the difference between the laws of matter and spirit, and especially in the law of division. Let me illustrate. An ounce of concrete illustration is often worth a ton of abstract reasoning. I take a material object, a sum of money, for example, and I divide it into two parts. I give away one part. The portion I retain is, of course, less by the amount given away. That law holds good for all material things. The portion retained is less by what is given. The law of



spiritual division is the opposite. Courage is a spiritual thing, the first and noblest of the virtues. A company of men on a battlefield are ordered to take a redoubt. The task is difficult and dangerous. It means death for some, if not for all. The men are human, and a wave of fear passes over them. They pale and shrink from the task. The only man who preserves his equanimity and courage is a young officer. By his words, and still more by his dauntless bearing, he imparts his courage to the whole company. His courage is not lessened by what he gives; on the contrary, it is increased. Faith is spiritual. You believe in God with your whole heart. You believe in Jesus Christ and worship Him. Through that faith you believe in yourself and in life generally, in what Robert Louis Stevenson calls 'the ultimate decency of things.' You meet some one who has lost faith in everything. By your words, and still more by your life, you have the inexpressible happiness of sharing your faith with them. Your own faith is not lessened thereby; on the contrary, it is indefinitely increased. Love is spiritual. You love God with your whole heart. You love father or mother or child with your whole heart; you have still the whole of your love that you can give to another.

Now the argument is this—Personality is a spiritual entity. It is spiritual in each of its component parts—in thought, feeling, will, conscience, and in that self-consciousness in which personality finds its crown. In its sum total it is spiritual. It conforms, therefore, to the laws of spiritual things; it can be given away and yet retained. Now human life in everything is imperfect, and a perfect example of personality given and yet retained can hardly be found. But analogies can be found so close that the perfect example may be readily imagined. A father and son (I knew one case) are alike in physical appearance—in form and feature, in stature and gait; they are alike also in mind and in feeling, in the outlook and the atmosphere of their life, so much alike that they seem like two editions of the same book with a different date. The son's personality was impressionable like wax; the father's was like a seal, and the seal rested on the wax for many years, with the result that seal and stamp could hardly be distinguished. Perfect reproduction of personality in human life is not found, but the likeness may be so nearly perfect that a case can be imagined in which it is perfect, and the son may truly say, 'To see me is to see my father; my father and I are really one.'

The Lord our God is one God. The unity of the Godhead is the central basal truth of our faith, a

truth that must be guarded from the taint of compromise. Mohammed might have been a Christian but for the perverted form in which Christianity was presented to him by the heretical sects by which he was surrounded. 'Christians,' he said, 'worship three gods—God and Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary.' Christianity, he meant, was plurality of gods, and he was right. The worship of the Virgin is beyond question polytheism. But when Jesus speaks of one God only, and tells us that His Being finds expression in three personalities equally Divine, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is there any contradiction there, any difficulty in receiving and believing that revelation? To my mind there is none.

2. The second avenue of approach to the Trinity is along the three ultimate units of reality. In the application of this argument to Transcendence and Immanence, a powerful statement of it is found in Streeter's book, *Adventure: The Faith of Science and the Science of Faith*, in a chapter on Religious Objectivity, by Mr. MacMurray. Here is the argument: There are three ultimate units of reality. The first is Inorganic, dead matter. That unit may be called mathematical; a stone is such a unit. To increase that stone you add another to it, a multiplicity of stones is a heap. The second unit of reality is Organic; it is biological. It possesses life. It is higher by a whole kingdom than the first. Life has the power of growth. A plant is such a unit. It grows in bulk, in height or in breadth, or both. The third unit, the highest we know, is Personality. The peculiar attribute of personality is Transcendence; transcendence above the rest of Nature, but transcendence also above itself, that strange power by which we can stand out of and above ourselves, by which ourself is the object of our thought, while we are the subject thinking, by which we can admire ourselves, or look a little closer and find precious little to admire; transcendence also above the personalities of others, by which we can enter into their personalities, and think their thoughts and act their part in the world. In other words, Transcendence also connotes Immanence.

The most transcendent personality in our race was that of William Shakespeare. What a mind was his; *facile princeps*, the greatest this world has known. How marvellous his power of entering into other personalities, real or imaginary. Now he is Antonio, the Merchant of Venice, so free and generous, so gracious, lending his money without interest, and so incurring the deadly hatred of the money-lender; now he is Shylock, whetting his

knife to cut his pound of flesh from the spot nearest Antonio's heart. Now he is King Richard III., tormented by conscience; and again he is Sir John Falstaff, the rollicking roué with no conscience at all. Now he is Hamlet, meditating deep on the present and the future; and now he is a grave-digger, philosophizing on the skulls he unearths in the graveyard. Now he is the wisest of men, and again he is a clown fooling on the stage. What infinite variety of character that marvellous mind was immanent in. The greater the transcendence of the mind, the greater also its power of immanence. Is it not along this avenue that the clue and the key are to be found to the seemingly incompatible truths of the transcendence and the immanence of God? Infinite Transcendence, Infinite Immanence, that is God.

But one thing must be remembered. God is present in everything, but only in the measure in which He can be contained in it. In a real sense God is present in a clod of earth, and it is only now that the secrets of Divinity in that clod are being discovered—its miracles of matter, its atoms, its ions, and its electrons. In a higher degree—far

higher—He is present in a plant, for the plant is alive. Higher still, He is present in human personality, for man is made in the image of God. He is a miniature of Godhead, if he only believe it and live it; but Jesus tells us that there are three Personalities in the Universe in which alone the whole of Godhead can be contained. Is there aught of contradiction in that, aught, indeed, that is difficult to believe?

3. The third avenue of approach to the doctrine of the Trinity is the teaching of the New Testament, and the experience of one's own soul. In Jesus Christ we have come to know God as Father, as Creator, the Maker of our mortal bodies, the Father of our immortal souls, the Giver of every good and perfect gift. In Jesus Christ we have come to know God as Son, the Revealer of God, the Saviour of mankind. In Jesus Christ we have come to know God as the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the Guide, the Teacher who leads us into all truth. To know God thus is to have a rock on which faith can be rested, certain that it never can be moved. 'I believe in God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, one God.'

## Contributions and Comments.

### A New Witness for a Famous Western Reading.

READERS of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will be interested in an addition to their textual apparatus in Ac 6<sup>15</sup>, in which a Western reading comes to light from an unexpected quarter, this time with geographical accuracy.

I have been lately reading the Life of St. Kentigern in Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliæ*. One of the first things that struck me was the fact that the hagiographer was a scholar and had a library; he makes his saint quote one of the *Similitudes* of Hermas, the one about the Elm and the Vine; he does not indeed mention Hermas by name, but there can be no doubt as to the source from which his reference is taken. We need not assume that it was Kentigern who had been reading Hermas; that would be to take legend too seriously; but we must at least allow that his would-be biographer had access to the *Shepherd*. It was interesting to find that the book had found its way to the British Isles, and I was so pleased with the discovery that I sent a note on it to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for

March. On reading further in Capgrave's text, we are told that St. Kentigern was at times so exercised in prolonged and intense prayer that his face was, as it were, on fire; the bystanders who looked on him saw his face as it had been the face of an angel standing in their midst.<sup>1</sup> Here there is an evident reference to the appearance of the face of Stephen when he was on trial before the Sanhedrin, and it is a reference made by way of a Western text, for it contains one of the famous Western glosses in the text of the Acts, the interpretation of which is still one of the leading problems before the textual critic.

First of all we transcribe the sentences from the *Life of Kentigern*:

'Intuebantur enim faciem eius tanquam vultum angeli stantis inter illos;'

where the last three words constitute the well-known gloss to which we refer. Now let us look at the text as it stands in the Codex Bezae, Ac 6<sup>15</sup>; the Greek is:

καὶ ἀτενίζον δε αὐτῷ πάντες  
οἱ καθημένοι ἐν τῷ συνέδριῳ

<sup>1</sup> *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (ed. Horstmann), ii. 121.



καὶ εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ  
ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου  
ἐστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν,

and the corresponding Latin is :

et *intuiti* in eum omnes  
qui sedebant in concilio  
et uiderunt *faciem eius*  
quasi *faciem angeli*  
*stans in medio eorum*,

where we have italicised the words which are closely related to the passage in Kentigern. There is not the least doubt that the writer of the legends has a glossed text of the Acts. In the same passage we may compare the reading of the Fleury text :

et cum *intueretur* eum omnes  
(qui er)ant in concilio, videbant  
vultū eius tamquā (*vultum*)  
*angeli dī stantis inter illos*,

where again we italicise the coincidences with the Kentigern text.

To the foregoing we must add the evidences of the Irish MS., known as the *Leabbar Breac* or *Speckled Book* :

uidebant faciem angeli  
*stantis inter illos*,

where again we have the gloss in close agreement with Kentigern.

Readers of my *Four Lectures on the Western Text*, published thirty-four years since, will find a discussion of the origin of this gloss. The latest reference to it is in the text of the Acts as published by Professor Ropes, as follows :

'J. R. Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text*, pp. 70-74, argues that the rendering of *stans in medio eorum* points to a text in which this related to the high priest and belonged to the following sentence (cf. Mk. xiv. 60); in reply see *Corssen, Götting gel Anzeigen*, 1896, pp. 434 f.'

Professor Ropes does not say whether the reply is convincing. Our readers may like to look into the matter for themselves. Meanwhile we make them a present of the new authority.

One further observation with regard to the evidence for this gloss in the text of the Acts. We ought to have before long a careful review of the revised edition of Nestle's Greek Testament, which has been brought out by his son, Dr. Erwin Nestle, and is not only a monument of filial piety but a real contribution to the study of the New Testament. It makes a genuine advance, both in the additional matters that are attached to the

text, and in those useless references to previous editors and the like which are now abandoned. A hearty welcome, then, to the new Nestle.

If we look at the critical apparatus of the text as Erwin Nestle presents it, we shall find that on Ac 6<sup>15</sup> the gloss which we have been discussing is credited to the Codex Bezae (D) and to two Latin authorities, marked *h* and *t*. The reference is obscure. Usually *h* means something to do with the text of Hort, but here, I suppose, it means the Fleury text. But what is *t*? Apparently no explanation is given of the abbreviation. So we are left to conjecture. Is it the text of the *Liber Comicus*? Yes! and the *t* stands for Toledo, from which this missal comes.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Birmingham.

## Ḳerākāḥ.

THE Arabic word *baraka* often means a good deal more than is conveyed by the common translation 'blessing.' Dr. Edward Westermarck in his book, *The Moorish Conception of Holiness (Baraka)*, and elsewhere, has pointed out that among the Arabs of Morocco the word 'is used to denote a mysterious wonder-working force which is looked upon as a blessing from God, a "blessed virtue."' He thinks it may conveniently be translated into English by the word 'holiness.' As Professor Elliot Smith has remarked, this is not at all a suitable translation. Indeed, it is so difficult to find a suitable equivalent in English, that Dr. Westermarck himself commonly uses the Arabic word *baraka* without attempting to translate it. People like 'holy men' or 'saints' possess this *baraka* in an exceptional degree. It is possessed also by certain sacred places; by certain animals; by certain mountains, rocks, stones, springs, trees; and by certain vegetables, fruits, and herbs. It is possessed even by certain names, such as Muhammad.

It is the purpose of this note to suggest that the Hebrew noun *berākah* and the verb *bārak* (in the Pi'el, Niph'al, and Hithpa'el particularly) often have the same kind of connotation. And here again it is difficult to find suitable translations. The translations 'blessing,' 'bless,' 'bless themselves' are not suitable. The only way out of the difficulty, therefore, is again to retain the foreign expression and to speak of *berākah*. In Is 65<sup>8</sup>, for instance, we read in R.V.: 'Thus saith the Lord, as the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it, so



will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all.' But 'blessing' is surely a tame translation. It would be better to render, 'Destroy it not, for there is *berākah* in it.'

Let me illustrate the suitability of this interpretation by translating some other Old Testament passages. The forms *bērēk*, *nibrak*, and *hithbārēk* I translate 'give' or 'ascribe *berākah*' to and 'get *berākah*.' Thus in Gn 1<sup>22</sup> we read, 'And God gave *berākah* to them, saying, Be fruitful and fertile, and fill the waters in the seas, and let the fowls be fertile in the land.' In Gn 2<sup>3</sup>, 'And God gave *berākah* to the seventh day and made it holy, because in it he rested from all his work which God had framed to do.' In Gn 18<sup>18</sup>, 'And Abraham shall become a great and powerful nation, and through him shall all nations of the earth get *berākah* (Niph'al).' In Gn 26<sup>4</sup>, 'And I will make thy seed abundant like the stars of the sky, and I will give to thy seed all these lands, and through thy seed shall all nations of the earth get *berākah* (Hithpa'el).' In Gn 27<sup>27</sup>, 'And he drew near and kissed him and whiffed the whiff of his clothes, and gave him *berākah* and said, See, the whiff of my son is as the whiff of a field to which Yahweh has given *berākah*.' In Gn 28<sup>31</sup>, 'And may El Shaddai give thee *berākah*, and make thee fruitful and fertile, so that thou become a concourse of peoples. And may he give to thee the *berākah* of Abraham, etc.' In Gn 39<sup>5</sup>, 'And Yahweh gave *berākah* to the house of the Egyptian on account of Joseph, and the *berākah* of Yahweh was in all that he had in the house and in the field.' In Ex 23<sup>25</sup>, 'And ye shall serve Yahweh your God, and he will give *berākah* to your bread and your water, and I will remove sickness from your midst.' In Nu 6<sup>27</sup>, 'And they shall put my name upon the children of Israel, and I will give them *berākah*.' In Dt 7<sup>13</sup>, 'And he will love thee, and give thee *berākah*, and will make thee fertile, and will give *berākah* to the fruit of thy belly and the fruit of thy ground, thy corn, and thy wine and thy oil,' etc.

The word seems often to have the same significance in the Psalms. In Ps 100<sup>4</sup> we read, 'Give thanks to him, ascribe *berākah* to his name.' In

Ps 96<sup>2</sup>, 'Sing to the Lord, ascribe *berākah* to his name, proclaim from day to day his power (*yeshu'ātho*).' In Ps 132<sup>15</sup>, 'I will give *berākah* to her provisions, her poor I will satisfy with bread.' In Ps 133<sup>9</sup>, 'Like Hermon-dew which flows down upon the mountains of Zion; for there Yahweh commanded the *berākah*—life for ever.' In Ps 145<sup>1</sup>, 'I will exalt thee, my God, the King, and will ascribe *berākah* to thy name for ever and ever.'

I submit that *berākah* in Hebrew, like *baraka* in Arabic and *mana* among the Melanesians, denotes often a magical or wonder-working power, and that the essential significance of the term is not properly indicated by the translation 'blessing.'

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

*The University, Manchester.*

### An Emendation of Psalm lxxii. 7.

HERE the Hebrew, as the text now stands, when viewed as an example of parallelism, must be relegated to the ranks of 'corrupt readings,' with Cheyne's condemnation, 'No poet would have written this.' Not even by the greatest stretch of exegetical imagination can any satisfactory parallelism be said to exist between the words 'men' and 'princes'; neither does this verse, when the introductory word אֲנִי is rendered by our 'but,' at all harmonize with what has gone before. Yet by a simple emendation of the Hebrew text, the alteration of a single letter, more or less perfect parallelism is restored; and, when אֲנִי is taken in its other sense, namely, as a strong asseverative, this verse is found to be in complete harmony with the preceding one. If, instead of אָדָם 'man,' אָדָר (אֲדִיר) 'magnificent' is read, vv.<sup>6,7</sup> will then run as follows:

'I have said, Ye are gods: and ye are all the children of the most Highest.'

'Surely ye shall die like the magnificent, and fall like one of the princes.'

W. H. A. LEAROYD.

*St. John's College, Durham.*



## Entre Nous.

### Sincerity.

When Lord Charnwood wrote his study of the origin and character of the Gospel according to St. John, he was drawn to add a postscript discussing not the origin of the creed but its truth, telling frankly what he himself really thought about religion. This epilogue attracted perhaps more attention than the work itself, and it is not to be wondered at that Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have thought well to publish it in the form of a little book. The title is *A Personal Conviction* (2s. 6d.).

'I start, more or less at random, from an observation which happens to have forced itself upon me long ago, regardless of such principles as I should probably have then professed. Towards any great man, alive or dead, except our Lord, the attitude of discipleship is unreasonable and unmanly; towards our Lord, as from a simple reading of the Gospel we all more or less conceive of Him, some sort of unaffected discipleship appears, as we go on in life, the only reasonable or manly attitude. . . . Some people, though they would shrink from putting the fact into words, would have to confess that they never get through their ordinary course of duty efficiently, except in a temper which is kept alive in them by the constantly renewed resolve of very humble discipleship to Him.'

The first certain fact, then, to Lord Charnwood is that men have had so far but one Master. The second is that He revealed the one Gospel that they could ever have. After a section on Sin and the Atonement—though the sense of Sin has been obscured to many people with repetition, he does not believe that it has been lost—he passes to the mystery of pain and to the mental processes that lead men to Christianity.

The religious apprehension comes, first, not as an assertion but as a command. Christ does not come to you and me saying, "I am the Christ." Without explanation He says, "Do likewise." "Get up and walk." His promise of a fuller light that we shall walk in lies behind.'

To the question, 'What is the *First Duty*,' Lord Charnwood answers: 'It is to be sincere towards yourself and the world. Only, since after all you are probably going to let yourself off something on the ground of sincerity, be quite thorough with the sincerity. It is not at all easy. Perhaps this simple reminder is better than any analysis of the very obvious ways in which humbug and cowardice

may take one to church or keep one away, or in which fidgety minds may skip or torpid minds drift to one conclusion or its opposite.'

'But I believe it is in every way helpful to recall that Christ demands sincerity. It is helpful, amongst other ways, in preventing that agony of religious questioning (attempting to force one's belief and never succeeding) to which more people than we suspect may be prone, but which surely is not God's desire. This demand of sincerity is a fact about Christ's religion which modern study reads quite clear in the Bible. And it is one of the dark stains on the history of all Churches for many centuries now that not only ecclesiastics, but congregations and crowds of Christians, have so often been the enemies of any fearless quest of truth or any straightforward telling of it. Even now many preachers and their congregations speak just as if conformity instead of truth could lawfully be made the primary aim. It would not be fair to say this without adding that the exact parallel holds good in politics, and in other walks of life—conceivably even in some scientific pursuits. The fact is, that it is harder and more unusual than we sometimes recognize for men to value truth as such very highly. That hard and unusual thing Christ demands. It would be slightly inaccurate to say that it was His primary demand, because life must not be artificially simplified by picking out some one element in the right life and putting it alone. But, along with some other things, honest facing of fact was an essential part of the childlike simplicity and singleness of heart which was His primary demand.'

### A Sense of Sin.

'Nobody can be healthily alive without having often tingled with impotent rage against himself for some thing that he has done. Of course this self-anger is often most unforgettable when it relates to some quite trivial awkwardness, and a man will almost blush half a century later about some boyish absurdity which he knows had its creditable side. Yet it is not true to say that we forgive ourselves our graver lapses, our actually foul acts, or perhaps fouler omissions. These are things of which, the truth is, we hardly dare think, and doubtless, though it is good for us sometimes to face them steadily, it would not be good for us to think often of them. So far as we do think of them, they are worse in our eyes than they would



be in the eyes of our friends or of our enemies either; it is no comfort to know that other people do equally despicable things; and the excuse of circumstances, temperament, etc., which we would willingly make for other people's faults, would be the worst mortification of our self-esteem if we made it for ourselves. This is, I am sure, the normal way of thinking for healthy minds, and it is not made much less so by the appalling ease with which we may lose this way of thinking in regard to the particular kind of fault which has become habitual to us.<sup>1</sup>

### Women and Holy Orders.

Canon Raven has just published a book which he is well aware will arouse fierce criticism. But there is a constraint upon him which brooks no refusal—to make his plea to the Church of England to admit women to Holy Orders on an equality with men. The volume is entitled *Women and Holy Orders* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). It is a persuasive book, full of careful reasoning, which merits widespread consideration. The most important chapter is the fourth, in which Canon Raven examines the argument from Scripture. For the admission of women is to him a matter of theological principle even more than of justice and expediency. Our Lord, he says, did not discriminate in His treatment of men and women. 'He horrifies His apostles by speaking to the woman of Samaria, and His host by permitting the woman who was a sinner to anoint His feet. He has women in the company of His disciples and accepts their ministry.' 'In him,' as Saint Paul declares, 'there is neither male nor female: we are all one.'

But what of Christ's silence—of the fact, first, that He nowhere establishes the ordination of women; and second, that He did not choose a woman as an apostle. The former fact, Canon Raven says, 'is scarcely relevant, for He never mentions either deacons or priests, or, indeed, any of the details of Church organisation. Here, as always He came, not to lay down a code, but to sow seeds that would live and grow and bear fruit.' Again, to use the argument that He did not choose a woman as an apostle is 'fatally to misconceive the whole purpose of the Apostolate. Apostles were missionaries, chosen and sent to a particular service. And to select a woman for such a task would have been at once unjust to her and practically futile. . . . It does not follow that because such work was im-

practicable for a woman in the first century, she is to be debarred from any authorised ministry for all time.'

Turning from the Gospels to the Epistles of Saint Paul, Canon Raven argues that in the passages in which the Apostle reaches his full stature, he, like his Master, sees all distinctions of sex and race, of class and culture done away with in the new age. When he is dealing, however, with more practical questions, he is less free from Judaism. 'Corinth, whose sacred prostitutes in the temple of Aphrodite gave their city's name to all women of loose life, was the place above all others at which scandal was most to be expected. There was bad trouble in the Church already: the town was full of women accustomed to identify religion with sensuality: the Christian community set great store by emotional excitement.' It was natural, then, that Saint Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians should declare that 'women must not speak' in the meetings.

After examining the directions in the Epistle of Timothy in some detail, Canon Raven says, even if it is possible 'to collect a few texts which imply that in the Apostolic age the exigencies of the time made it impossible to secure the full and immediate realisation of the Kingdom of God upon earth, the whole tenor of the New Testament is plainly against any final adherence to the subjection of half the human race.'

In the first century, immorality was open and general, and it was in such a depraved world that Jesus proclaimed the Sermon on the Mount, and committed the task to His disciples of so permeating human life by His spirit that gradually the conventions and resistances of men should be overcome, and all things be made new. The little Church of Jerusalem soon learned that if it was to survive, it must be prepared to grow slowly, and so we find them giving sanction to temporary arrangements, but if we mistake these for 'the eternal principles of the Gospel of Jesus, we shall wholly misconceive the character of Christianity and shall make of it a mechanism, not a way of life.'

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

<sup>1</sup> Lord Charnwood, *A Personal Conviction*, 26.